

DOCTORS,
VACCINATION,
AND
UTILITARIANISM,
BY
H. STRICKLAND CONSTABLE

YALE
MEDICAL LIBRARY



HISTORICAL
LIBRARY



DOCTORS,
VACCINATION,
AND
UTILITARIANISM,
BY
H. STRICKLAND CONSTABLE,
WASSAND,
HULL.

The Small-pox Epidemic which, a while since, so unaccountably spread
after twenty years of compulsory Vaccination.—*Herbert Spencer.*

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

YORK: J. SAMPSON, 13, CONEY-STREET.

1873.

STATE
MEDICAL
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY



CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS....	...
I. WHO SHALL DECIDE, WHEN DOCTORS DISAGREE?	1
II. IMPEDIMENTS TO REFORM IN MATTERS OF OPINION ...	20
III. THE SUPERSTITION THAT A PERSON WILL NEVER HAVE THE SAME DISEASE TWICE. ...	51
IV. MEDICINE NOT YET A SCIENCE. ...	57
V. SUPERSTITIONS ABOUT INFECTION. ...	84
VI. THE GERM SUPERSTITION ABOUT DISEASES ...	110
VII. THE SUPERSTITION THAT DISEASES ARE SO MANY POSITIVE ENTITIES. ...	118
VIII. GOVERNMENT MEDDLE AND GOVERNMENT MUDDLE ...	134
IX. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS. ...	159
X. ADVICE TO PARENTS WHOSE CHILDREN HAVE BEEN KILLED BY VACCINATION. ...	174
XI. UTILITARIANISM....	182

ERRATA.

Page 10, line 14, for "again" read "gain,"

„ 34, „ 2, for "out foul" read "out of foul,"

„ 38, „ 17, for "Humphrey" read "Humphrey's,"

„ 68, „ 3, for "actions" read "action."

„ 103, „ 5, for "he takes" read "be taken,"

„ 138, „ 25, for "some" read "some one."

„ 159, „ 2, for "here" read "there,"

„ 161, „ 17, for "add" read "ad."

„ 234, „ 8, for "give you" read "give."

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS.

I CAN fancy someone, after reading the following pages, saying, "This is making a great fuss about mere doctors' questions." But if doctors' questions are not worth making a fuss about, what are? Certainly not political questions, for they are at bottom nothing but money questions. Now surely, matters of life and death are more important than those that have merely to do with the pocket. Of course, there are greater things still. I need not say that matters relating to spiritual life and death are infinitely more important than either.

I say politics are mostly nothing but money questions, Taxation is, of course, nothing but legions of money questions. Towns want country to pay most—country wants towns to pay. By disendowment, Nonconformists aim at some of the Anglican loaves and fishes, not an unnatural aim, though perhaps rather felonious; Socialists want other people's money; Agriculturalists want protection for their produce; Manufacturers want protection for theirs; Working men want legislative permission to blow up competing workmen with gunpowder; Capitalists want protection from

strikes : Publicans want to sell adulterated gin without check ; 'Needy Politicians want to be paid for legislating ; Rich politicians want the privilege of legislating to be confined to those who pay most money for it ; and so I might go through the whole catalogue of political questions with few exceptions. Education perhaps, has not quite so much to do with money, and the ballot is comparatively pure ; it is only a bill to ensure the concealment of lies at elections.*

I repeat, then, that with the exception of questions of spiritual life and death none are so important to the human race as those relating to bodily life and death, that is, to "mere doctors' questions," especially as the two are so intimately connected.

Dr. Johnson said that amateur writers have no chance against professionals. I have no doubt, as a rule, he was right. Still, the former have one advantage. Professionals must try to please their readers ; their bread and butter depends upon their doing so ; whilst a man to whom it does not signify what the public thinks of his writings, says what he believes to be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, simply because there is no reason why he should do otherwise.

* Voters consist of those who tell the truth about the way they vote and those who tell lies. The Ballot of course is only for the latter. Whether this measure is a good or bad one is another question.

Telling unpopular truth to the public never seems to have any effect. Still, unpopular truth should be told ; for some good may follow though one cannot tell how. It may be contradicted ; or it may find here and there a disciple ; or the author of it may be reviled ; or he may be held up to the scorn and ridicule of all right thinking persons, in some one of the journals that appear on the last day of every week. In one or other of these ways attention may be drawn to a subject, and thus some small contribution be made towards a better state of things.

I well know that any criticism this little publication may receive will and ought to point out its inartistic discursiveness. But, in the first place, I am not an artist, and in the second place, England is a comparatively free country where everyone may write as he likes so long as he harms no one. If anybody was obliged to read it, it would be another matter.

ATHENÆUM CLUB,

Pall Mall,

November, 1872.

CHAPTER I.

WHO SHALL DECIDE, WHEN DOCTORS DISAGREE ?

CIRCUMSTANCES that occurred more than a year ago in my family have led me to turn my attention to the subject of Vaccination. Wishing to learn the truth about the matter, I gathered together a few facts and opinions upon the subject, from experienced medical men. As the question of Vaccination is just now, in consequence of the present small-pox epidemic, engaging a good deal of attention, I think it right to place these opinions and facts before the public. I may then perhaps venture upon a few comments of my own, although, as I am not a medical man, they are not likely to have much value. What I learnt was as follows :—

- (1) That statistics prove indisputably the extreme utility of Vaccination, small-pox having much decreased since Vaccination has been general.
- (2) That statistics prove indisputably the extreme futility of Vaccination, small-pox having much increased since Vaccination has been general.
- (3) That cases are constantly found where the only unvaccinated member of a family alone of that family caught small-pox.

How Doctors differ.

- (4) That cases are constantly found where the only unvaccinated member of a family alone of that family escaped small-pox.
- (5) That in Sweden, small-pox has been extinguished by Vaccination ever since 1863.
- (6) That in 1866, in Sweden 5398 persons, all of whom had been vaccinated, died of small-pox.
- (7) That the complete absence of small-pox in Ireland is due to Vaccination being well carried out in that country.
- (8) That small-pox has been worse in Ireland than in England.
- (9) That Vaccination is unnatural and wicked.
- (10) That neglect of Vaccination is a crime.
- (11) That most of the statements against Vaccination are lies.
- (12) That most of the statements in favour of Vaccination are untrue.
- (13) That a man who objects to having his younger children Vaccinated because the elder ones have been killed by the operation should not be forced by penalties to consent.
- (14) That children should be taken by force out of their mothers' arms by policemen and Vaccinated, and the father, if he objects, should be treated as a felon.
- (15) That the opponents of Vaccination being interested, their evidence is worthless.
- (16) That the advocates of Vaccination being interested, their evidence is worthless.
- (17) That Sir Cullen Eardey died from Vaccination.

- (18) That although this is true, he would have died from the scratch of a pin or a tight boot.
- (19) That the first Lieutenant and several men (all re-vaccinated) of H.M.S. Octavia, died of small-pox.
- (20) That although they died, they had the disease in a mild form.
- (21) That the treatment of small-pox being the same now as it was formerly, the diminution of deaths in those who are attacked cannot have anything to do with the treatment, but must be due to Vaccination.
- (22) That whereas, formerly, small-pox was treated by copious bleeding, administration of brains of a cock-sparrow, the fat of a he-goat, blood of weasels, and crabs' eyes, by the exclusion of fresh air, and by scarlet blankets, scarlet curtains, and a scarlet coat for the doctor to put on when he paid his visit ; at the present time the treatment is in some respects different.*

* I read a letter in the *Lancet* the other day on a new mode of treating small-pox. The treatment consisted of washing the patient three times a day.

A few years ago, a German physician announced to his friends that he had discovered a new remedy for disease, which was invaluable, not only as a cure, but also as a preventative, and that he had proved it indisputably by carefully conducted experimentalization on his own person. He kept it a secret for a long time, as medical men have sometimes most unjustifiably done in cases of new and valuable discoveries ; but at length he was prevailed upon to give it to the world. He said, "Ich wasche mich."

- (23) That Vaccination is the greatest blessing ever conferred upon the human race ; Christianity perhaps coming next.
- (24) That Vaccination is the cause of all the ills of life, and that if a person is somewhat decrepid at ninety, and he can be shown to have been Vaccinated in infancy, the decrepitude is completely accounted for.

Thus far had I got in my investigations, when at length I began to see the error into which I had been led by my wish to arrive at an impartial judgment. Examining both sides of a question can possibly lead to nothing but confusion. So I decided to do what I ought to have done at first. I decided to examine and seek for only the opinions of the advocates for Vaccination.

What I learnt was as follows :—

- (1) That Vaccination is an almost perfect safeguard against small-pox.
- (2) That Vaccination has no protective effect against severe small-pox.
- (3) That lymph should only be taken from a healthy child.
- (4) That it is no matter whether the child be healthy or not.
- (5) The re-vaccination ought to be compulsory.
- (6) That re-vaccination ought never to be resorted to because it is apt to produce gouty inflammations, erysipelas, pyæmia, angioleucitis, and phlegmanous tumefactions.
- (7) That this epidemic of small-pox was brought from France by the emigrants.

- (8) That it was in London before any emigrants came.
- (9) In England, that it was brought from the Continent.
- (10) On the Continent, that it was brought from England.
- (11) That the more punctures the greater the protection.
- (12) That one puncture is as good as a hundred.
- (13) That few doctors can Vaccinate well.
- (14) That a doctor who cannot Vaccinate well, can do nothing well.
- (15) That Vaccination has diminished small-pox enormously.
- (16) That Vaccination has never been well enough performed to cause any diminution of small-pox.
- (17) That all lymph comes originally from the greasy heels of diseased horses.
- (18) That although this is true with regard to most of the lymph in use, some of it has come direct from the cow.
- (19) That deaths from Vaccination are not nearly so numerous as is pretended.
- (20) That in all deaths from Vaccination, either the child had a bad constitution, or the lymph was bad, or the lancet dirty, or the cow or the doctor in fault.
- (21) That Dr. Raul, in France, reported 450 cases of horrible diseases being communicated by Vaccination.

- (22) That statements from hot-headed Frenchmen cannot be trusted.
- (23) That impurity of lymph is easy to tell by the eyesight.
- (24) That impurity of lymph cannot be discovered even with the strongest microscope.
- (25) That Dr. Bakewell, M.D., is Vaccinator General of Trinidad.
- (26) That small-pox is not one of the diseases of Trinidad, such a thing being unknown there.
- (27) That people ought to be re-vaccinated because the effect only lasts 20 years.

Do.	do.	15	„
Do.	do.	10	„
Do.	do.	5	„
Do.	do.	1	year.
- (28) That parents object to their children being Vaccinated from conscientious motives.
- (29) That parents object to their children being Vaccinated because they wish them to die of small-pox in order to be saved the expense of their maintenance.
- (30) That re-vaccination is a perfect safeguard.
- (31) That five re-vaccinated soldiers died this year of small-pox at the royal barracks in Ireland.
- (32) That the medical profession pocket three million pounds a year in Vaccination fees.
- (33) That this is overstated.
- (34) That this is understated.
- (35) That when Dr. A. kills a child, it is (says Dr. B.) because he does not know how to Vaccinate.

- (36) That when Dr. B. kills a child, it is (says Dr. A.) because he does not know how to Vaccinate.
- (37) That lymph will not bear keeping.
- (38) That lymph improves with keeping, like old port.
- (39) A good many months ago, when Ireland was free from small-pox, that the fact was due to Ireland being effectually Vaccinated.
- (40) Afterwards, when small-pox raged in Ireland, that the fact was due to Ireland being ineffectually Vaccinated.

I could fill volumes with similar contradictory opinions held by the advocates for Vaccination. It is really very disheartening to an earnest searcher for truth to find such hopeless difference amongst the doctors ; but I suppose there is no help for it.

A few years ago, I jotted down from the news-How the Cat-
tle Doctors
differed. papers, opinions of the cattle doctors about the cattle plague. A few of them were as follows :—

- (1) On the Continent, that the cattle disease was imported from England.
- (2) In England, that it was imported from the Continent.
- (3) That the disease never attacked the lungs.
- (4) That the lungs were always more or less affected.
- (5) That there was no cure for the disease.
- (6) That the only cure was homœopathy.
- (7) That the cure for it was water slightly acidulated with tincture of sesquichloride of iron.

- (8) That the disease being caused by insects, the way to arrest its progress was to put musquito curtains in the cow sheds.
- (9) That the disease being caused by drovers' dogs, the way to arrest its progress was to tie up the dogs.
- (10) That the way to cure the diseased animals, was to wash their faces and to wipe their eyes.
- (11) That the best remedy was whisky and port wine given by the gallon.
- (12) That this remedy being tried on Miss Burdett Coutts' cows, they all died, after suffering first from "excitement."
- (13) That the best remedy was a little weak beef-tea every half-hour.
- (14) That the best thing to do on the appearance of the disease was to inoculate all the healthy animals in the tail.
- (15) That if this was judiciously done, the tail would frequently come off, but the life of a valuable animal would be saved.
- (16) That the best precautionary measure with every healthy animal was to paint its nose with tar.
- (17) That the disease was caused by the introduction, from the interior of Africa, of the insect called the "Tsetse."
- (18) That if canvas bags filled with camphor were suspended from the necks of all healthy animals, there need be no further anxiety on their behalf.

(19) That the real cause of the disease was the bite of a small but malignant black spider, common in the steppes of Russia.

These are a few of the opinions of the cattle doctors, exactly as I copied them out of the newspapers. At that time I attributed this want of unanimity to veterinary ignorance, but I am beginning to see that it is a necessary condition of the art of healing. I now understand why lawyers have such an objection to medical witnesses in a law case. They say not only that no two ever agree, but that no one doctor even ever seems to know what to think himself, so how puzzled the public must be. I myself, am of a confiding, if not credulous disposition, and always anxious to believe what I am told. But what am I to think about Vaccination when I am told so many opposite things? I can only try and make what I can of those facts, about which there seems to be no difference of opinion. But they are very few.

In the first place, then, it seems to be allowed by everybody, that whereas the only object of Vaccination is to prevent small-pox epidemics, there has now been raging for a long time all over the United Kingdom, one of the most fearful epidemics of small-pox ever known, an enormous majority of the sufferers showing by marks on their arms, that they have been Vaccinated.

In the second place, all seem to agree that Vaccination, according to the meaning of the word as understood for the last seventy years, that is to say, Jenner's Vaccination, and Jenner's doctrines about

Where Doctors agree about Vaccination.

Jenner's ideas proved to be false.

it, for which he received £30,000 from the government—that these things have completely broken down—they are proved to be false.

The new
safe-guard
against
small-pox.

In consequence of this break-down, the medical profession have discovered some new safeguards against small-pox. They say, that if the Vaccination rite be performed in four or more different places instead of one, and if this be repeated every two, five, or ten years; also, that if this new system be rendered compulsory by the government—that then the country will be safe. This new system of Vaccination will probably treble or quadruple the emoluments of the profession, and if a separate fee be charged for each puncture, the pecuniary again will of course be enormous; but I am sure if the object sought for be gained, and there be no drawbacks to set off against the advantages, no right thinking person will grudge it.

I see it stated, that Sir W. Jenner recommends annual re-vaccination. This would bring up the emoluments to a fabulous amount. But it is a mistake to suppose that all these sums of money would be a complete loss to the public, though they would of course be a complete gain to the doctors. A great proportion would go back to the community; that is, to the tailors, and shoemakers, butchers, and bakers, in the doctors' employ.

It seems that small-pox epidemics may be expected in the natural order of things, (supposing sanitary matters to remain the same,) perhaps three or four times in a century. It of course requires an epidemic to prove the truth or untruth, of any so

called safeguard against epidemics. Therefore, in about thirty or so years, we may expect the new system of Vaccination to be tested.

Although only indirectly connected with the subject, I must mention one other point where unanimity seems to reign in the profession. I do so, because it always gives me so much pleasure to witness harmony and agreement. It seems then that all doctors agree in thinking that the government ought to appoint more medical inspectors to see that Vaccination is effectually carried out in large towns ; and also that their salaries ought to be larger than they are.

What is the theory of Vaccination put into plain words ?

It is this, as I understand it.

That in the beginning God created the world and he thought it was very good ; and so it might have been but for one unhappy oversight. He had made no provision against small-pox. At length, after many ages, the Creator's error was rectified by a country apothecary of the name of Jenner, who found out that, by taking some half putrid * matter from a diseased cow and inoculating men with it, the consequences of the unhappy mistake made at the creation might be completely escaped for all future time, unless, indeed, like many other races of animals, cows became extinct, in which case, of

How doctors agree.

Theory of Vaccination in plain words.

* According to the best authorities, lymph from an ulcer is "Tissue that has undergone retrograde metamorphosis or become partially decomposed."

course, the human race would be reduced to its old sad predicament.

Now, I confess, the natural presumption in my mind is against this theory. But after all we must not go by mental presumptions, but by facts—plain unexaggerated facts. It is a pity people always weaken causes they take up by exaggeration. It is impossible for any impartial investigator into the question to doubt that great numbers of children are killed directly or indirectly by Vaccination. But that is no reason for attributing to it every evil that afflicts humanity. Saying such things only ends in creating ridicule, and therefore inattention to their cause. I know when people feel strongly, it is hard to avoid exaggeration, Nor do I expect parents who have lost their children by the rite to be cool and philosophical. I know there are people with cold blood and flabby minds who can be so. But one might as well be a cod fish at once. No, I am too well acquainted with circumstances of a similar nature to expect anything so unreasonable. Still the fact remains, that the man who exaggerates injures his cause instead of forwarding it.

But what is the truth, and what are the facts? Every one must judge for himself. Nine-tenths of statistics are worthless, for they are prepared by people who are in favour of one side or the other; and we all know that, in such cases, any tricks can be played, even honestly, with facts, figures, and ingenuity.

Not being a medical man I am without experience; and yet, even I know of three deaths from Vaccina-

tion, two all but deaths, and two cases of horrible sores commencing about the eighth day after the operation and lasting many years. In the latter cases, the parents (my own gamekeeper and his wife) being remarkably strong healthy people. Then what is the use of a doctor, with vast experience, coming and telling me he has Vaccinated a hundred thousand children—that no harm ensued in any of the cases—that not one of them has ever died since—that they all turned out exemplary Christians—and that some of them even lived to become very wealthy men? Of course it all passes by me like the wind, and I care not whence it cometh nor whither it goeth.

One doctor tells me that no medical man of any Honorable men. repute has ever been opposed to Vaccination. And yet he is an honorable man.

Another tells me that nothing is of any use against small-pox except Vaccination—that cleanliness and purity of air are of no more avail than filth and impurity. He too is an honorable man.

Another doctor tells me that the stories about horrible diseases being imparted by Vaccination are completely without truth. He too is an honorable man.

All these are honorable men.

Then how are we to account for these statements, and innumerable others of a similar nature? I think it can be done by discoveries philosophers have from time to time made in human nature.

Hobbes, of Malmesbury, says, that if it could be Hobbes of Malmesbury. proved to be indisputably more universally advan-

tageous to the human race for 2 and 2 to make 5 than that they should make 4, 2 and 2 would make 5 and no one single person would have the slightest doubt about it.

Herbert
Spencer.

Herbert Spencer says, that it is not intellect that rules in this world, but desires and character; that opinion does not arise from logic but from wishes.

Hazzlit.

Hazzlit says, that with the generality of mankind, belief on disputed topics is determined by considerations of personal ease and convenience in the teeth of logic. In fact, he says, "people generally stick to an opinion that they have long supported, and that supports them."

Rochefocault

Rochefocault says, "l'esprit est toujours la dupe du cœur."

Mr. Lecky.

Mr. Lecky says, that opinions are usually the result of numerous influences, of which self-interest is the most powerful. A man may pursue his enquiry in a most conscientious spirit, but the nature of his argument will always be determined by the secret bias of his wishes.

Mr. J. Mar-
tineau.

Mr. James Martineau says, that the smallest probability will outweigh the greatest if it fall in with our wishes.

Loss of the power of judgment always, more or less, accompanies a life's exclusive devotion to one pursuit. Some doctors seem to devote their lives to the one subject of Vaccination. Now nothing shows a more stupid want both of charity and imagination, than that common accusation of dishonesty against these men in consequence of the extraordinary things they say upon the subject of this (as they

seem to think it) almost religious rite. He who devotes his whole life to one subject gets gradually to lose all power of seeing anything else in the universe. He gets to believe in nothing else, and to be unable to understand anything that is said against it, like that immortal Athenian tanner, ^{Nothing like leather.} who, when asked what a statue of some great general should be made of, said "there's nothing like leather." And I have not the slightest doubt that he honestly believed that a leathern statue would be more durable, and in every way more suitable than one made of either marble or bronze.

A hair dresser once said to me, "if ever I'm ill, sir, I gets my 'ead well brushed." And I doubt not he honestly believed in its complete efficacy to cure anything.

Jenner brooded over Vaccination till he seems to have gone rather mad about it. He wanted to Vaccinate all the dogs in England ; and it is stated that he Vaccinated some of his own family to death.

Bishop Berkeley laughed at a mathematician for thinking the soul must be "extension," and at a musician for thinking it must be harmony.

Ask a lawyer what is to be done for any one of the ills of life. At once he says "there's nothing like leather." Bring it into court and you will be made happy for ever. So it is in everything.

I look upon this peculiarity of human nature as a providential arrangement for the good of man. Whatever his hand finds to do, he soon learns to take an absorbing and exclusive interest in it, and

wherever there is absorbing interest there is almost always contentment and often happiness.

Safety valve
for the Med-
ical con-
science.

One of the causes why medical men are so often accused of dishonesty, arises from the impossibility of proof in cases of disease, and the consequent loop holes left for the conscience to get out of. To give an instance.

The boiler of a steam engine bursts, blows a man up and kills him.

An action is brought against the owner of the steam engine.

Dr. Thompson is the medical witness on the boiler's side.

Dr. Thompson is in the witness box.

Counsel: Now Dr. Thompson, can you state that the man was killed by the blowing up of the boiler?

Dr. Thompson; No, I cannot.

Now what loop hole can there be here for the doctor's conscience? Plainly this. He says to himself, "How can I state such a thing? The man may for years have been subject to an affection of the heart. The complaint may have reached its height just at the time of the explosion of the boiler, and he may have actually died of that most distressing complaint, angina pectoris, at the very moment when he was up in the air.

Another time a man's head is turned into a pancake by the wheel of a railway engine. Action brought.

Dr. Thompson is now employed by the railway company.

Counsel : Now, Dr. Thompson, I suppose your evidence is to the effect that the engine killed the man ?

Dr. Thompson : No, it is not. Then he says to himself, it is impossible for anyone with so scrupulous a conscience as I have, to swear any such a thing. The man may, the moment before the engine reached him, have stumbled ; fallen with his head on the rail and died of a fractured skull before the wheel touched him. Perjury is a fearful crime.

Another time it is a Vaccination case.

Counsel : Now, Dr. Thompson, was that child killed by Vaccination ?

Dr. Thompson : No, it was not. Then he says to himself, the child died of erysipelas. Of course, I know that was caused by the Vaccination, but I am asked what caused the death, not what caused the erysipelas. Now Plato says, that perjury is a worse crime than murder.*

Plato's opinion of perjury

Now in all these three cases Dr. Thompson bears false witness, and yet, at the same time, his evidence is honest and conscientious. The mistake people make in judging others is to compare their conduct with ideal perfection. It is quite right that they

* When Plato says that a deliberate lie is worse than murder, he no doubt meant that instead of being merely brutal or animal it is diabolical. That is, it requires the combination of intellect with selfishness and absence of conscience, whereas murder only requires violent animal passions. I must say, I think undoubted perjury ought to be more severely dealt with by the law than it is. Nothing so much as perjury and lies causes the defeat of justice. Now justice is the one thing that keeps society together and renders civilization possible.

should do so, but their conclusions will be one-sided, and therefore defective, unless they also compare them with the other extreme. And what is the other extreme? Medical gentlemen, disciples almost to a man, of Mr. Darwin, must say that the other extreme is the conduct of apes. From this point of view, Dr. Thompson's evidence becomes admirable. For if he is really descended from an ape, that he should have a conscience of any kind is marvellous. Where did it come from? The ape has none. But "*ex nihilo nihil fit.*" Indeed his whole conduct in the witness box becomes admirable. That he should attend carefully to the questions put to him, that he should stand decorously in the box instead of perching himself on the edge of it, or chattering gibberish, or scratching himself, or snatching off the wig from the head of the gentleman who is cross-questioning him, or seizing his brief, carrying it to a remote corner of the court, and tearing the leaves out gently, one by one—all this, from a scientific point of view, becomes very wonderful, and shows a development, an advance, and a progress that is simply astonishing.

These are merely instances to show what may take place in the minds of perfectly conscientious men.

The safety valve to the conscience in such cases, is the impossibility of absolute proof in all human matters. And thus we can account for otherwise unaccountable evidence sometimes given by doctors, certainly, as honorable a set of men as can be found in any profession.

I have no doubt that, if all evidence depended on interested witnesses, justice would be impossible, trials would be a farce, and society would collapse. What renders civilized society possible, is the fact that the generality of witnesses are not interested, or very slightly so, and thus, in no doubt most cases, justice prevails.

CHAPTER II.

IMPEDIMENTS TO REFORM IN MATTERS OF OPINION.

“If ever I hear anyone speak of an unalterable law, the only effect it has upon me is, to convince me that the speaker is an unalterable fool.”—SIDNEY SMITH.

ONE great impediment to reform in matters of opinion, whether medical or otherwise, arises from that curious but common kind of pride which prevents people from confessing that they have been wrong.

Illustrative
anecdote.

An Irishman is being examined on a horse case, in a court of justice. He swears the animal was fifteen feet high ; But later on in the trial, he says “fifteen hands.” Why, says the counsel, a short time ago, you swore he was fifteen feet high. “Did I,” replies Pat, “then bedad I’ll stick to it. The horse *was* fifteen feet high.”

Now what makes him stick to it is, I suppose the kind of pride of which I am speaking.

Archbishop
Whateley.

But besides unwillingness to change an opinion, there is often, in somewhat stupid people, an inability to do so. Archbishop Whateley said, “a man will never change his mind who has no mind to change.” He also says, that, considering the uncertainty there is in all knowledge, if a man per-

sists beyond a certain degree in one set of opinions without change, it shows he is either a fool or a rogue, and that he ought, therefore, to be disqualified from sitting in Parliament, or taking any part in public affairs. "The largest minds are the least constant," says Bacon. And Faraday says, "In knowledge, that man only is to be despised who is not in a state of transition." And again, "Nothing is so opposed to accuracy of philosophical deduction as fixity of opinion."

On the other hand, there no doubt is, in a large fraction of the human race, a sort of thickness of the skull, which, I believe is a providential arrangement against too great instability in human affairs. Porson, the great scholar, had a marvellous memory. After his death, this was accounted for. The bone of his skull was found to be extraordinarily thick. Thus, the knowledge once in could never get out again.

The same sort of pride I alluded to above, makes doctors of the old school say that the constitution of the human race has changed since they were young, and, therefore, that the violent measures of former days are no longer necessary.

Instances of obstinate resistance to new ideas are, of course, innumerable.

Many celebrated doctors, the late Dr. Copland amongst the number, strongly opposed the use of chloroform, under the plea that pain was a beautiful provision of nature, designed by a merciful providence, to facilitate the cure of sufferers under operations.

Dr. D. Tuke, in his excellent new work, quotes the following from a newspaper :

“ Dr. Gull, in 1847, questioned the desirability of removing pain. Brandsby Cooper was averse to the prevention of suffering. Pain, argued Dr. Pickford and Mr. Nunn, exercises a beneficial influence ; and Majendie, who said to the writhing dog, ‘ taisez vous mon petit,’ observed, that an invention to annul pain was of small interest to surgery.

Miss Nightingale.

Miss Nightingale taught that all zymotic diseases arose spontaneously from impurity of some kind. The doctors all called her mad, but the vox populi took Miss Nightingale’s side against the doctor’s, and now they are gradually coming to her side also, compelled to do so by the common sense of their customers, the general public.

Cervantes and Molière.

Men of genius, that is to say, men of great original powers of thought, even though they are not doctors, often see further into truth on medical matters than the doctors themselves. Cervantes, Molière, and others, wrote strongly against bleeding and other violent remedies.

Esprit Moutonnier.

Another impediment to reform is the “ esprit moutonnier.” When a leading sheep makes a small jump over nothing, every succeeding sheep makes the same jump over the same nothing.

A man in one of the colonies, was driving a thousand sheep through a covered bridge over a river that ran 400 feet below. When two-thirds across, the leading sheep saw light through a small open window on one side. He jumped through it

and fell into the river below. The next sheep did the same, and the next, and the next. The down-pour of sheep lasted an hour. Nothing could stop them. They went over every one of them. I merely give this as an illustration of the "esprit moutonnier."

Goethe says, "in this world there are so few voices and so many echoes." Bishop Berkeley says, "few men think, but all have opinions."

An Empress wears a preposterous garment. Immediately every woman, everywhere possesses herself of a similar preposterous garment.

A medical pundit brings forth a new guess. The majority of the profession at once adopt the guess as gospel, till some day a still greater pundit guesses a contradictory guess. Sometimes when this is the case a curious phenomenon takes place. Every doctor under forty adopts the new guess, whilst all the others stick to the old one. The latter indeed will sometimes be the case even where it is more than a guess. Hervey said he never could succeed Hervey. in convincing any medical man above forty of the circulation of the blood.

One more illustration of the "esprit moutonnier."

A good many years ago, a clock holding a very Anecdote. influential position in the metropolis, lost one of its hands by rust, and for the next twenty years we saw church clocks all over the country, pointing the time with only one hand.

Mr. Galton wrote a curious article in Macmillan's Mr. Galton. magazine not long ago, showing the loss of mental independence men experience who live in large

towns and large communities. He illustrated it by animals in Africa. Those which go in herds lose all self-dependence, so that if one is separated from the rest, it seems utterly unable to judge for itself what to do.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

In *Oliver Twist*, Brittles, the footman, under Mr. Giles, the butler, is being examined by the magistrates. "Now Brittles," says the magistrate, "answer me truly." Are you a protestant? What are your religious opinions? "God bless me," says Brittles in great trepidation, "I - that is - I mean - - they are the same as Mr. Giles'.

Now if Brittles had lived a rather more isolated life, he might not only have acquired a certain degree of independence of character, but perhaps even become possessed of some religious principles of his own.

Quot homines
tot senten-
tice.

On the other hand, we all know the opposite principles expressed by the proverb, "*quot homines tot sententice*." But this only means that human nature is made up of a marvellous bundle of opposite principles, every one of which must be considered, if we wish to arrive at an approximation to truth. In the present questions there would be little difficulty in showing where each of these two principles would be likely to prevail.

Unconscious
bias from
interested
motives.

To return to unconscious bias caused by interested motives.

We must not forget that unconscious bias in a witness is more deceiving than intentional dishonesty. For whilst the evidence is equally false in both cases, the appearance of honesty in the first leads to a

greater belief in the truth of it. Anything can be proved by ingenuity, especially in such a science as medicine, where effects are so difficult to trace to their causes. Boyle, a cautious philosopher, believed, Boyle, from what he thought indisputable evidence, in the "Aurum Notabile." Mrs. Stephans proved by Mrs. Stephans innumerable instances, the efficiency of her nostrum of snails and egg shells, for which the government of the day granted her £5000. And St. John St. John Long, when tried for manslaughter, brought any number of witnesses to swear they had been cured by his ointment and cabbage leaves.

Again, I say, I bring no charge of intentional dishonesty. When beer drinkers, brewers, publicans, and sinners, resist all reform in the management of public-houses, their evidence on the subject, though perfectly honest, is not what it would be, if they did not believe that their interest was concerned. When landowners said that repealing the corn laws would ruin the country, they honestly believed what they said, only their evidence was suffused all over with a fine rich colouring which was derived from supposed self-interest. When people left off wearing pig tails, and the wig makers sent deputations to Parliament to petition for the wearing of pig tails to be rendered compulsory by legislation, on the plea that if this were not done England would sink to a second rate power, they were perfectly honest, only their evidence was given under a bias produced by self-interest. When Judge Hale burned people Judge Hale, for witchcraft, he honestly believed it was his duty to do so; only, neither he nor anyone else in that

age could free himself from a belief which he had sucked in with his mother's milk, and had had inculcated into him every subsequent day of his life. Now the belief in, and evidence for, Vaccination, may possibly contain in them these three ingredients : self-interest, hereditary tendency,* and habits of thought during a life-time. Even I, who have found out the trick, find myself in unguarded moments believing in Vaccination, in consequence of the strong instinctive feeling produced by having been born and bred to it.

Arguing in a
circle.

The following is a very common instance of puzzleheadedness or arguing in a circle in Vaccination cases.

A child dies from Vaccination.

The doctor is asked how he came to die ?

Because the lymph used was impure.

But how do you know the lymph was impure ?

Because the child died.

Medical
wrath.

With regard to this Vaccination question, medical gentlemen, on both sides, seem to work themselves up into great indignation over the opinions held by their antagonists ; but this is like the grammarian

* It requires only a very short time for a mental tendency to get into the blood, and thus become in the succeeding generations innate. A dog is taught to beg, that is, to sit npright with its fore paws donbled down. But the dog's progeny will beg without being taught. Wendell Holmes tells a story of a man who was in the habit of pulling his old father out of the house to one particular spot and thrashing him ; and when he grew old, his son, who had inherited the mental tendency, adopted exactly the same habit and always thrashed him in exactly the same spot.

who invoked the eternal wrath of heaven upon his adversary on account of his opinions upon the preter-plus-perfect tense. It is a matter for investigation, not wrath. Moral wrong alone should rouse that.

The opponents of Vaccination must not expect an inborn faith, that has got to form a part of the human nature of this generation, to vanish quickly. It took hundreds of years for Englishmen to cure themselves of belief in witchcraft ; and the forces ranged on the side of Vaccination, are perhaps nearly as strong as those were on the side of witchcraft. There is, first, the pecuniary interest of the whole medical profession, a profession composed for the most part of excellent, honorable, kind-hearted, well-educated, and often highly intelligent men, who have the run of all our houses, who are believed in by most, and who exercise the influence such men must exercise. Secondly, there are all our habits of thought on the subject, both inherited and acquired by education. And thirdly, there is female vanity. Whenever I think of this last force I despair. And yet this very force ought to be ranged on the other side. Many opponents of Vaccination assert that all life-long skin affections are the results of Vaccination. This of course is an exaggeration. And yet from instances I (though without experience) know to be true, I cannot doubt that Vaccination very often does leave this consequence.

I am afraid that a man is rather a selfish animal. He hears of abuses, but so long as they do not touch himself, he swims with the stream and dis-

regards them. He hears of people's children being killed by Vaccination, but he only half believes it, and scarcely gives the thing a thought. One day a child of his own is struck down, and then he opens his eyes.

Why Vaccination ought not to be compulsory

Vaccination ought not to be compulsory, if for no other reason but this. The Act of Parliament is sure to be carelessly and therefore unsafely carried out. In towns, the operation is intrusted to the

Bob Sawyers.

younger members of the profession.—The “Bob Sawyers in fact, I have been told by an experienced physician, that the practice is to scratch one baby after another with a lancet, shove in any kind of stuff, and think of nothing but getting the thing over. And it must be so, I am sadly afraid, that no legislation that was ever invented, not even a Parliament elected under household suffrage, backed up by the Crown, the Lords, and the whole British public, would be able to alter the peculiarities of Mr. Sawyers' natural disposition. Besides, it is utterly impossible to insure purity of lymph in these

Legislative meddle and muddle.

wholesale proceedings. Legislative interference, with the wishes of parents in the matter, must, I fear, be classed under that very large head expressed by the phrase, “meddle and muddle.”

Vaccination Committee.

Of course there could be only one result to the investigation of the committee on Vaccination.

A politician must legislate for men as they are, not as they may be at some future time. And the majority of men as they are, believe in Vaccination. If, 300 years ago, a committee of the House of Commons had been appointed to examine into the

truth of witchcraft, the evidence given in its favour would have been absolutely overwhelming, and their report and the consequent legislation, ought to have been in accordance with it, for otherwise the House of Commons would have been looked upon as a set of dreaming fools, utterly unworthy of the confidence of the country. In later times, if a committee had been appointed to examine into the truth of the popular superstition, that blood-letting at the spring and fall of the year was a beneficial practice, the evidence in its favour from medical witnesses would have been overwhelming. Again, I say, legislation must legislate for men as they are, not as some exceptional people think (however rightly,) that they ought to be. Take that (so-called) great philosopher, Mr. Mill. He thinks that at some future time, men will believe in his doctrines, that—
Mr. Mill
and his
doctrines.
to give a few of them—women, as proved by history generally, and the small kingdoms of India and Hindostan in particular, are more fit to govern nations than men ; that for a man to have many children is wicked, because it interferes with the labour market ; that the property of people who die without a will should be confiscated, and their families left paupers ; that a ruined man should be punished for his misfortunes by penal servitude ; that no motive can be higher than a love of self ; that if a man makes a purchase with a view to its rising in value, that increase, when it takes place, should be appropriated by the state because it has not been gained by manual labour ; that the question of belief in a God should be left an open one ; that the words interested

and disinterested, have really the same meaning; that A when he picks B's pocket, having no free will, is compelled to do it by God, if there be a God, if not, by those forces of nature that take His place. These are a few of the doctrines, as I understand them, that Mr. Mill believes mankind will some day rise to.* But what would the country say, if a committee of the House of Commons, appointed to consider them, reported in their favour, and recommended immediate legislation in accordance with their report? No, the way to get the Vaccination Act repealed is to convince the public that the doctors are wrong, as has been done in the case of violent bleeding.† Do this, and legislation will follow like

* Mr. Mill is supposed to be at the head of the utilitarian school. The coming time when everybody is to believe in him, is called the John Millennium. Macanlay said of utilitarianism, that it is not much more foolish than phrenology, and far more humane than cock-fighting. Sidney Smith said, that if utilitarianism were true, we ought, as soon as old people became useless, to make portable soup of them. He also said of a notorious utilitarian, "he is so hard that a wagon wheel would make no impression on him, and if a hole were bored in him with a gimlet, I am sure that sawdust would run out." The sceptical, hesitating tone of the present day tends to make all talk and writing weak and mealy-mouthed. Now, though courtesy to the man himself is of course right, language cannot be too strong, nor ridicule too great, to express one's indignation at, and contempt for, what one believes to be false and pernicious nonsense. Matthew Arnold's "sweetness and light," which simply means good-natured cold intelligence and taste, is all very well in its place, but if there were nothing else the world would collapse forthwith. What carries it on is something much warmer, more earnest, and more real.

† A short time ago I was paying a little bill to a blacksmith, a real Yorkshireman. He said to me, "doctors vetnaries and black-

sheep. In fact, the result of the committee was of course determined before ever it met.

Tennyson wrote what he called "Recollections of Tennyson, the Arabian Nights," that is, he epitomised into two pages the general impression left on his mind by reading through the nine-hundred pages of the Arabian Nights.

Under a similar idea, I will just put down in a few sentences the general impression left on my mind, after perusing the proceedings of the Vaccination Committee.

Mr. Smith, a medical man is being examined.

Chairman : I understand, Mr. Smith, that you sacrifice £500 a year, rather than continue to hold the office of public Vaccinator, and that you do so in consequence of the great number of deaths from Vaccination that you have witnessed. Is this true?

Mr. Smith : Yes, I sacrifice at least £500 a year.

Chairman : And you really have known children killed by it ?

Mr. Smith : Yes, great numbers; besides still greater numbers who were seriously injured for life by it.

Chairman : What form do the injuries usually take ?

"smiths are the ignorantist men there is. If yan's well, the doctors
 "maks yan ill or kills yan. Monny a yan's been killed by bleedin.—
 "Look at Doctor—he telled me a bit sin he'd nobbut bled two men
 "in his life, and that he killed yan on em." He then went on to
 vetnaries, and concluded with blacksmiths. I need not say that I
 utterly disagree with him. Instead of being the ignorantist, doctors
 of the present day are perhaps nearly the most educated class of any.

Mr. Smith : Erysipelas is very common, convulsions often ensue, and Vaccination often causes terrible sores and skin affections, which last perhaps a life time.

Chairman : The small-pox is prevalent just now. Have any of the sufferers being Vaccinated ?

Mr. Smith : Yes. By far the majority of sufferers have the marks of Vaccination on their arms.

Chairman : So that in these cases Vaccination did not prevent deaths from small-pox ?

Mr. Smith : Certainly not.

Chairman : (to the other members of the committee) Gentlemen, you will I am sure agree with me, that it is unnecessary to continue this investigation ; for you must now be convinced that Vaccination, besides being absolutely harmless, is a complete and certain safeguard against small-pox. (To medical witness) : We will not trouble you any further, sir. You may retire. (The Committee breaks up.)

Buckstone in
the force.

“Have you a strawberry mark on your left arm?” says Buckstone in the farce to his supposed long-lost son—“tell me, I beseech you,” he says in a voice of intense emotion.

No, I have nothing of the kind whatever.

“Then you are my son—my long-lost boy, says Buckstone,” come to my arms (clasps him in his arms and faints dead away).

Reform must
come from
outside the
profession.

But reform must come, not only from outside the House of Commons, but also from outside the medical profession.

It was from outside of the profession that reforms in the old practices of inoculation, violent blistering,

bleeding, and administration of enormous quantities of mercury came ; and we learn from M. Flouren's *M. Flouren*. "Histoire de la découverte de la circulation du sang," that the medical profession scouted Hervey, *Hervey*. called him a quack, just as they now call opponents of Vaccination "men of no repute," and that he lost his practise till his discovery was at last taken up by Molière, Descartes, Boileau, and other men of genius, that is, men who have the power and originality to think for themselves.

I have, in this chapter, endeavoured to give some hints, with a view to showing why superstitions die hard ; and why the death of errors is always a lingering one, after once they have got a hold on the public mind. Writings against them have generally very little immediate effect, though that makes it no less a duty to write against them. In the time of George III., a Mr. Tucker wrote an excellent pamphlet in favour of letting the American Colonies go, if they wished it, without opposition. But he was only called an amiable lunatic. When an influential class think themselves interested, the death of an error is more lingering still. About sixty years ago, the Rev. Sidney Smith wrote very cleverly to show *Rev. Sidney Smith*. that spring guns and man traps, to shoot and catch poachers, were not exactly suited to a civilized state of society, but it was of no use immediately. Of course the country gentlemen of the period called him an atheist, but the practices lasted for years longer.

There has lately been just the same sort of foolish ferment going on in the public mind about small-pox,

as there was a few years ago about the cattle plague. Then, instead of taking the cattle out foul cow houses, and saving them by pure air, pure water, and good food, our authorities, after sitting humbly at the feet of cow doctors, instructed us that the disease bubbled up out of the ground, somewhere in the middle of Russia, spread to England, and could only be cured by killing the cattle. Now that, partly no doubt from some peculiarity in the season, we have small-pox amongst us, instead of compulsory cleanliness we are all maundering about compulsory Vaccination. Luckily these poor sufferers from the disease are not cattle, or we should kill every one of them ; as in fact was done formerly. We learn from the old chronicles, that "in y^e yeare 1313, y^e King of France burned all his pocky folke, as well men as women." Nothing like stamping out.

Dr. Garth
Wilkinson.

Dr. Garth Wilkinson (whose writings American Emerson seems to admire for insight into truth more than those of any other Englishman) reckons the deaths from Vaccination to have been more than 90,000 in the last forty years, but it is very difficult to understand how the British public can have allowed such a massacre of the innocents.

Mr. Darwin thinks, though I can hardly bring myself to agree with him,* that morally, though not

* And yet the Missionaries tell strange stories. One of them relates how, in translating the Bible, his difficulties were insurmountable amongst one tribe of savages. They had innumerable words for every kind of violence, wickedness, theft, murder, and sensuality, but not one single one for any kind of virtue. When he came to the text "God is love," he almost had to give it up in despair. When he

intellectually, the highest apes are superior to the lowest men, because they do not practise infanticide, nor tell lies. But if Dr. Wilkinson is right, it is not only the lowest men who practise infanticide. I must say I think his mode of computation not an unfair one. He says, that although a few doctors may not know of any fatal case, on the whole, each medical man in the country knows of at least two or three deaths, either directly or indirectly from Vaccination. From what has come under my own observation, I cannot doubt that he is much under the mark. Now if three be multiplied by the number of doctors who have practised in the country during the last forty years, the resulting figure must be a high one.

Dr. Hitchman, formerly a public Vaccinator at Liverpool, said in his evidence before the committee, "I have seen hundreds of children killed by Vaccination."

Dr. Collins said that he sacrifices £500 a year, by refusing to Vaccinate, and that in consequence of the numerous fatal results he had witnessed.

Evidence
against
Vaccina-
tion.

I learn from Dr. Pearce, that in 1862, Dr. Marone published an account of many deaths from Vaccination, which he had not dared to publish earlier,

asked them for a name that would best represent a being to be revered and worshipped, he could get nothing but that of a celebrated medicine man, who had been dead a hundred years, and who went by the name of "crooked-knee." When he came to the other word, and asked what feeling gave them the noblest and most exalted sensation of mind of which they were capable, their answer was "The taste of meat in a state of half-decomposition,"

partly because of his reputation, and partly from fear of injuring Vaccination.

Dr. Pearce also says, that Dr. Ballard, although he wrote in favour of Vaccination, gives many instances of what he calls "disasters," and adds, "such cases do not all come to light."

Concealment of truth about Vaccination seems to date from Jenner's time. Jenner himself says, "I wish my professional brethren to be slow to publish fatal cases of small-pox after Vaccination." He also wrote to Mr. Dunning, "The Medical Society of Portsmouth have reported cases of small-pox after Vaccination. What a set of blockheads!"

The fact is, it seems the practice always to call these "disasters" by other names—usually, perhaps, erysipelas.

Jenner said that successful Vaccination ought always to be accompanied by a certain degree of erysipelas.

7165 children under five years of age, died of erysipelas between 1862 and 1867.

Sometimes the case is officially described as "convulsions from teething," as in one mentioned by Dr. G. Wilkinson.

One case was registered as death from blood poisoning, caused by contact with dirty rags. This poor doctor must have been at his wits end for a substitute.

Mr. Emery stated, in his evidence, that he had lost a child from Vaccination. The verdict at the inquest was, "died from erysipelas caused by Vaccination. The coroner (a medical man) said to the

jury "gentlemen, you must modify that verdict." The foreman of the jury said, we will do nothing of the kind.

Dr. Shaw of New York says, "I have seen fearful convulsions caused by Vaccination, and that in strong children."

Dr. Collins says, "convulsions are very common after Vaccination."

Many medical men state that children are often a mass of sores and ulcers after Vaccination.

Mr. Addison stated before the committee that his child had been killed by Vaccination. The official report was, "died of pyæmia." He also stated that he knew of hundreds of cases where children suffered from sores for years after Vaccination.

Mr. Birch, a poor law guardian, has published some cases :

A child of one of his own workmen was killed by Vaccination. Certificate of death, "scarlet fever."

Other cases were related to him by a parish doctor. Mr. Birch asked him how he could, with such facts, continue the practice of Vaccination.

The answer was, "we doctors must live."

An exactly similar answer was once, at a trial in France, made by a French criminal to the judge. The judge replied, "je ne vois pas la necessite;" and condemned him to death forthwith.

Anecdote of
French
Judge.

"*We doctors must live!*" Thus this wretched man confessed to Mr. Birch, in so many words, that he and his brethren got their livelihood by systematic murder.

Voltaire. The hero of one of Voltaire's "Romans" asks a soldier what his business is. The soldier answers, "mon metier est, de tuer et d'être tuer pour gagner ma vie."

Mr. Baker, a barrister, said in his examination, that he knew of a child who suffered from a dreadful disease in consequence of Vaccination. Of course, he said, in all such cases the parents are told that the Vaccination has nothing to do with the evil consequences, but the parents know better.

The stereotyped statement of doctors in cases like the above is, that the child is suffering from some constitutional and hereditary disorder.

A pious doctor.

One doctor says it is wicked to neglect Vaccination, because it is a blessing conferred upon mankind by a merciful providence. He is like Isaak List, the Jew, in Humphrey Clock. Isaak is trying to persuade the old man to steal Mrs. Jarley's money. He says, "if the old lady does keep the money in a box, and if she does put the box into an open drawer, and if she does sleep in a room, and never lock the door for fear of fire, I should say there's a providence in it, but then I was religiously brought up.

Voltaire.

Voltaire, in one of his "Romans," describes an inhabitant of the planet Jupiter, taking a turn about the solar system to see what he could see. At last he came to our earth, but concluding it was not inhabited, he departed again almost immediately. He said, "ce qui fait que je pense qu'il n'y a ici persome, c'est, qu'il me parait que des gens de bon sens ne vondraient pas y demeurer." I wonder what such a being would do if he came again and

found that the earth was inhabited by beings who put into the veins of their children some half-putrid matter from a diseased brute in order to improve their health and ensure them a long life. I think our friend from Jupiter would cut his visit still shorter even than before. Still the effect might undoubtedly be exactly the opposite. We read in the journal of a shipwrecked traveller,—“After walking eleven hours without having tracked the print of a human foot, to my great astonishment and delight, I saw a man hanging on a gibbet. My pleasure at the cheering sight was inexpressible, for it convinced me that I was in a civilized country.”

Mr. C. Read, M.P., said in the House of Commons, “an unvaccinated child is a nuisance and ought to be put down.” Luther said that a certain sick child was a nuisance and must be drowned in the river because it was bewitched. It is very sad to see the world thus going from bad to worse in foolishness and superstition. Of course it was very wrong of Luther saying this, but at any rate, in one sense, a sick child undoubtedly is a nuisance sometimes. But to call every healthy child, as God has made it, a nuisance that must be put down, and to be applauded for saying this by a large assembly, composed of at any rate average sensible men of the era, is very discouraging to an enthusiastic man like me, who is always hoping for progress instead of retrogression. I see it stated, that Sir W. Jenner and other great authorities say, that no one is safe (that is, every one is a nuisance) who is not re-vaccinated once a year (when small-pox is prevalent,) with five

Mr. C. Read,
M.P.

separate punctures on different parts of the body. I have no doubt that poor Mr. Read has been himself re-vaccinated within the last year, with five separate punctures, in different parts of his body. Should this not be the case, however, I am afraid he will have to be classed among the nuisances to be “put down.” But if so, how about his constituents?

What will become of them?

A simple-minded doctor in Ireland holds forth on the benefit of re-vaccination. He says, “there are numbers of the military (all re-vaccinated, stationed in my district, and amongst them there have been only five deaths from small-pox.” Why how many would he have had?

Doctors seem to have the strange idea that naturally people would be always having small-pox. I believe it is a remains of the old pagan notion that the earth is the devil’s and all that is therein, and that, consequently, evil and disease are the rules, and good and health the exceptions. This mode of thought was kept alive by Calvin, and no doubt prevails largely still. Wesley said, Calvin’s God was worse than his devil; and really when we consider that this God of his consigns to eternal and inconceivable torment all infants who die before they are baptised, I cannot see that Wesley was far wrong.

Anecdote. Professor De Morgan tells a story of two Scotch Calvinists. One says to the other “Noo hoo monny d’ye thank there are of the elact on the arth at this moment?

Eh, mabbee a doozen.

Hoot mon! Nae so monny as thot.

Savages, and people with undeveloped intelligences, are unable to notice the good things they enjoy, but they cannot help being conscious of the exceptional evil things they suffer. Thus they consciously believe in nothing else but evil ; that is to say, they only believe in the devil ; and only believing in him, they very properly, under the circumstances, address all their prayers to him ; for otherwise, they of course could not pray at all. An increase of intelligence makes men understand that they are sons of God, not of the devil. Is this increase very general yet ?

Of course the truth is, that instead of evil and misery being the results of God's laws, they are the simple results of the infraction of God's laws, in consequence of the stupidity, indolence, intemperance, and filthy and impure habits of mankind. What ! Was the destruction of Pompeii the fault of man ? Certainly it was—of his stupidity for ever building the town there at all.

I am no optimist, blind to the inevitable evil there is in the world—exceptional evil that cannot be explained. But really inevitable evil is very exceptional. Suffering is almost always a mere consequence of the sufferer's own folly or that of his forefathers.

The public have been told ever since Jenner's time that Vaccination saves people from small-pox.

An epidemic comes and carries off Vaccinated and unvaccinated alike. The doctors are up to the occasion. Of course, say they, it must have been so—these unfortunate people, had none of them

been re-vaccinated. A little time passes, and the re-vaccinated are found to die. Of course they do, say the doctors, for they were only re-vaccinated in one place, whereas there ought to be at least four punctures.

There are few things that afford to a person who is capable of appreciating humour, more amusement than a ready-witted answer, under circumstances that would naturally be expected to cause confusion.

Illustrative
anecdote.

"Won't your honour give a copper to a poor blind man," whined an Irish beggar with close shut eyes. Ten minutes afterwards, he was met again by the same person. But this time his eyes were wide open.

"Why you old scamp," he said, "you can see as well as I can."

Cattle plague.

"Well, and isn't it a blessing to be thankful for?" A few years ago the cattle plague raged in England. Great numbers died. The cow doctors said that inoculation in the tail would prevent their catching it. They were inoculated in the tail. Still they caught it. Of course they do, said the doctors, for in addition to inoculation in the tail, their noses should be painted with tar every day. So they painted them with tar. Still they died. Of course they die, said the doctors, for in addition to inoculation in the tail, and the tar, each animal ought to carry a canvas bag, filled with camphor round its neck. And so they went on, till at last the epidemic ceased, as all epidemics do, sooner or later; ceased in spite of the cattle doctors, who did what they could by

shutting up the animals in dark, hot, foul cow-houses to keep it alive.* In the appreciation of cleanliness are our own doctors much better ?

* Farmers have been told for years, that if they would persist in keeping animals in a manner, that amongst human beings must produce pestilence, they would suffer for it sooner or later, by the animals and their progeny becoming subject to disease. They are suffering for it now, and yet all they can think of is, in England, to maunder about the diseases being brought from the Continent, and on the Continent, to maunder about their being brought from England. Almost all fat beasts fed in foul cow-houses (and all cow-houses are foul) have more or less liver complaint. Most farmers keep their cows tied up all winter in foul cow-houses, and without natural exercise. Nothing produces a tendency to feverish complaints so much as a defective condition of the liver. Every complaint under the sun is hereditary. Human "Rinderpest," or the innumerable forms of zymotic fevers, may be caused amongst men by anything that produces diminution of vitality, such as under-feeding, over-feeding, bad air, bad water, &c. Again, acclimatization can only take place by animals and their progenitors being exposed to the climate, day and night, winter and summer. Instead of which, farmers do all they can to acclimatize their beasts to filth, darkness, heat, and repletion, and then expect the succeeding generations to bear wet, cold, and starvation with impunity. As to "Rinderpest," about which there is just now so much fuss and folly, it and foot and mouth disease are simply different forms of zymotic disease, one mild and the other severe, like chicken-pox, small-pox, or typhus amongst men; and always originating from defective management of either the beasts themselves or their progenitors, and from nothing else; the shades and gradations of these zymotic diseases being infinite. No two cases exactly alike, though the mere senses and intelligence of men often cannot distinguish the differences.

The other day there was great agitation about a fatal case of supposed rinderpest in the East Riding of Yorkshire. One of a herd of thirty beasts, most, but not all of which, had foot and mouth disease, died. Why did it die? Some said rinderpest, some said foot and mouth. But as to which it was, or what particular one of the in-

I fear it is an undoubted fact, that some doctors assert that cleanliness and purity of air and water are of no more avail against small-pox, than dirt and impurity. That nothing but Vaccination is of any use.

In all I say on these subjects I try to be moderate. I try to make allowance for what at first sight looks so like dishonesty. I try to recall the strong unconscious bias pecuniary interest produces in perfectly honest men. I try to believe that these men who deceive the public, have first deceived themselves. In these attempts I generally succeed. But there are limits; and when I hear of men teaching the harmlessness of filth—the *one* original cause of all the zymotic, or, as they are sometimes called, the filth diseases—the *one* cause of all pestilences, and all the terrible human anguish that accompanies them—I say, when I think of these things, I no longer pretend to restrain my indignation—my righteous indignation—for it is righteous indignation. We flog a garrotter—a miserable creature, taught from his birth to thieve, and only taught to thieve; and we do right. Then what ought to be done to the highly educated medical scoundrel, who, for the sake of bolstering up his tottering Vaccination fees, causes

Medical
Scoundrel.

numerable shades of variety taken by the zymotic disease it was—
“who shall decide, when the doctors disagreed?”

One more hint about disease in cattle.

Daniel Lambert weighed fifty stone, and died early in life, in consequence of having a diseased constitution. And yet the one object of all cattle breeding is to produce in cattle, as far as it can be produced, this same kind of diseased constitution.

infinitely more misery than the garrotter, by teaching what every educated man at the present day knows to be a lie? We hang a wretch, who, maddened by drink, murder's some one person; and we do right. Then what ought to be done to the wholesale medical murderer, who brings death to thousands by preaching the innocuousness of everything that produces pestilence and disease?

The *Pall Mall Gazette*, a few months ago, laughing at some doctor who had been trying to make out that no occupation is so salubrious as working in sewers, says, "The results of his enquiries are most gratifying, and suggests that for persons desirous of escaping attacks of fever, no more desirable course could be adopted than that of taking service in the sewers, under the metropolitan board of works. Out of many men only five have had typhus. But whilst contact with sewage in any shape seems desirable, the perfection of health, can only, as we gather from the returns, be acquired by living directly over a sewer. In fact, it is evident that the medical faculty ought to consider whether their patients' trips to the sea side might not be profitably varied by the occasional occupancy of a favourably situated sluice-house." Pall Mall Gazette.

It is the old story of believing disease to be the rule instead of the exception. Of course these strong men naturally would have escaped fever altogether but they worked in sewers, so four or five of them got typhus.

I cannot join the *Pall Mall* in merely laughing at those doctors who preach the harmlessness of filth.

Wreckers.

There have been on some sea coasts men called wreckers—villains, who, by hanging out lights and by other means entice ships on to the rocks, in order to rifle the pockets of the drowned sailors. I cannot content myself with merely laughing at such men. A man who can witness suffering without pity, and without indignation at the cause of it, is simply a jelly fish, let him have the intellect of a demi-god, or, rather as it would be in such a case, of a demi-devil.

Doctors cut
their own
throats.

Coleridge says, that a rogue is only a fool with a circumbendibus; and doctors who teach doctrines opposed to the common sense and experience of mankind, only cut their own throats and drive the public to hydropathists, homœopathists, and other medical nonconformists. No-practice is better than mal-practice; and at any rate these nonconformists teach the all-importance of cleanliness, correct diet, temperance and purity.

The doctor "*The Pall Mall*" laughs at may possibly be a well-meaning stupid man, quite incapable of discovering the workings of his own mind, or the real meaning of his own facts; but medical men who teach the salubrity of dirt must not expect to escape that terrible accusation that has so often been brought against them, of doing these and similar things, in order that they and their brethren may fatten upon the pestilences they have occasioned.

In medical matters, when one opinion is broached, one has never far to go to find its opposite; and, in fact, I see that whereas one doctor teaches the salubrity of sewers, another, Dr. Bateson, of South-

wark, shows, by instances, that working in sewers is an extremely unhealthy occupation.

I will suppose, for a moment, and for argument's sake, that Vaccination does act as a slight and temporary safeguard against small-pox. I say slight and temporary, for the doctors no longer say it is complete and permanent. But say they, if a safeguard at all, it must be expedient. But what is expedience? It is a word used by short-sighted men to express one or two good consequences they think they see, when there are thousands of which they can know nothing. Expediency.

The experience of ages, if nothing else, has taught man what is right and what is wrong. But he knows almost nothing of consequences—nothing of the future.

Introducing filthy matter from a diseased brute into the veins of every born human being *must* be wrong, whatever the apparent expediency.

Many moral philosophers, with great names, including I believe that most excellent man, and most admirable writer, Father Newman, have asserted that where the expediency is sufficient, a lie is right.

I say, that whatever the apparent expediency, a lie *must* be wrong.

Apparent expediency is nothing, because real expediency is inscrutable.

A man (as has often happened) saves the life of a fellow-creature by a lie. This proves to him that a lie is right, where the expediency is sufficient. He hands this doctrine down to his children, and to their children, one of whom, acting upon the destruction

Wrong must
be wrong
whatever
the appar-
rent expe-
diency.

Illustration
of this.

of conscience produced by it, robs a bank; another ruins great numbers of people by forgeries; and a third certifying that a rotten ship is sea worthy, sends a thousand souls to the bottom of the Atlantic. These being merely a few of the innumerable evil consequences that resulted from the lie told by the grandfather.

To my argument against Vaccination, on account of its being so disgustingly contrary to nature, I doubt not some brilliant logicians will answer, "the same argument condemns all remedies, for all remedies are unnatural; it is unnatural, for instance, to amputate legs." Certainly it is; but we don't amputate the leg of every healthy child that is born as soon as it arrives at the age of three weeks. Again, he will say, "it is unnatural to give quinine to a person who has the ague." Certainly it is; but we don't administer quinine to every person who has not got the ague. Unnatural conditions of health may well require unnatural remedies.

It is said, that the present agitation against Vaccination is unworthy of consideration, because it is in a great measure confined to the lower classes.

I will compare one comparatively small thing to two very great ones.

Father New-
man.

Father Newman, in his "Grammar of Assent," says, "Our Lord was a sort of smith, and made ploughs and cattle yokes. Four Apostles were fishermen; two, petty tax-gatherers; one, a coachman; and another, a market gardener. Peter and John were described as illiterate men of the lower sort."

Christianity.

Celsus says, "the Christians are weavers, shoemakers,

illiterate clowns." Low-born fellows, says Trypho, "collected from the lowest dregs of the people." Says Cæcilius, "ignorant credulous boors, &c., &c."

Protestantism, like Christianity itself, began from Protestantism, below. Campion, the Jesuit, uses just the same language with regard to the first English Protestants, "they were petty tradesmen and mechanists." Roman Catholic missionaries sent to reconvert the English, declared that their only opponents were to be found amongst the vilest of the people.

When professional, or class abuses became unbearable, the general public have to interfere; witness the Reformation, the French Revolution, Clerical Nonconformity, Medical Nonconformity, &c., &c.

It is a common phrase, that "history repeats History repeats itself itself." Vaccination has flourished seventy years, and inoculation flourished for seventy years before it.

The doctors held on to inoculation as valiantly as they now hold on to Vaccination. The same words and the same arguments. The doctors denied that any harm ever came from it, and the mine of female vanity was just as well worked as it is now. A celebrated Dr Mead taught that inoculation came Dr. Mead. from Circassia, and that the beauty of the women of that country was entirely due to it; like Madame Rachel, a few years ago, and her elixir, to make Madame Rachel. people beautiful for ever, and which was brought from a rock in the middle of the great desert of Sahara, on swift camels, she having purchased at an enormous outlay, the exclusive right of obtaining it.

What are dupes made for, if there are to be no dupers?

Doctors pretend to prove by statistics, that the per centage of recoveries, where there are four clear Vaccination cicatrices, is enormous. But what proportion of the population have these marks? The thing is simply a figure juggle. During the cattle plague, a cow doctor boasted that he had cured 50 per cent. by his system. Upon enquiry, this turned out to be true. The man had had two cows under his care—one died and the other didn't.

CHAPTER III.

THE SUPERSTITION THAT A PERSON WILL NEVER HAVE THE SAME DISEASE TWICE.

DR. MAUDESLEY, in his excellent work, says, “any tissue which has been subject to a particular morbid action, is more liable to take on that action again—has, in fact, a sort of acquired aptitude for it.”

Now, the theory of Vaccination is founded on the opposite doctrine, that after a person has once had small pox, or a disease of a similar nature, he will never have it again. But I have read of very many cases where a person had small-pox twice, or more than twice, and sometimes of their dying of it at last ; a notable one being that of Louis Quinze, of France. Oh, but say the doctors, these people have peculiar constitutions, so they do not count. But if subterfuges of this kind be allowed in argument, anything can be proved, and anything can be disproved.

Theory of immunity from a disease in consequence of having had it once.

Louise Quinze

During the cattle plague, at a place where the disease was raging, some cows that were well managed escaped the infection. “Oh, but,” said the cattle doctors, “they are Alderney cows, so they do not count.”

Alderney Cows.

The elder Mr. Weller, in *Pickwick*, was maintaining that no coachman ever wrote poetry. Sam, his

Sam Weller.

son, mentioned one who had done so. Oh, but said Mr. Weller, senior, "he vos a Cambervel man, so that does not count."

During the cattle plague, the cow doctors maintained that the plague had been successfully stamped out in Aberdeenshire, by wholesale slaughter. An instance occurred that showed the contrary. Oh, but Cattle Doctor, said the doctors, in that case, a shepherd's dog brought the infection, so that does not count. However they stamped it out again, and again it appeared. Oh, but said the doctors, a cask of butter from an infected district brought it. And so they went on for two or three times more.

For many months, the cattle doctors completely proved, to the satisfaction of everybody, that the plague was brought by railway into Revel. At last, they were told that there was no railway into Revel. Oh, but, said they, we didn't mean Revel, we meant Riga.

Having a dangerous disease like small-pox, even once, is a very exceptional thing in the life of a man; therefore having it a second time is so extremely unlikely, that when it does happen, I should naturally account for it, by supposing that the first attack caused a predisposition to the second.

A man breaks his leg. He does not break it a second time. My explanation of this is, that breaking one's leg at all, is an extremely exceptional thing. But these are not the views of the doctors, who evidently look upon disease as the natural condition of every one's health. People who devote their lives to any one thing are apt to become unable to

see or believe in anything else in the universe but that one thing.

Doctors say their theory is proved by cases where people who have had a disease once, afterwards, on being exposed to infection, escape catching it again. But a very eminent physician, with immense experience, once told me, he did not believe a person was a bit more likely to catch a disease in the same room with it than any where else; and the whole lives of doctors and nurses prove this assertion to have much more truth than most people would suppose. No part of the population is perhaps so generally free from disease as doctors and nurses. The stereotyped answer to this is, that by habit, doctors and nurses get to resist infection; but, as I have said above, if childish subterfuges of this kind are allowed in argument, anything can be proved and anything can be disproved.

Doctors and
Nurses.

Medical men have so very much to do with the imbecile, the infirm, and the weak in body and mind, that when they converse with a man in full possession of a strong intelligence, they seem liable to forget whom they are talking to.

Then would you, I hear some one say, allow children in the same room with a small-pox or scarlet fever patient? Certainly not, nor in the same house—perhaps not in the same town, for the existence of these diseases proves, as a rule, the air, or the water, or both, of the house in which they break out to be impure; the cause being generally due to the defective drainage of the whole town.

Bad drainage
of towns.

Is there a properly drained town in England?

In many a house where there is seldom or never any perceptibly unpleasant smell, the air is really sufficiently impure to tell gradually upon the health of those who breathe it day and night, hour by hour. And then come constant colds, and now and then, in an unhealthy season, scarlet fever, small-pox, measles, typhus, &c., &c. So long as communication exists between drains and houses, this must be so more or less.

A common feverish cold is simply the first stage of what is called "zymotic disease," and it is caused by the same things—defective ventilation, defective or imprudent diet, bad water, &c. It is "*fons et origo omnium morborum*" according to the old saying about it. Those are most subject to it who live in hot rooms, who coddle themselves, and who shudder at healthy pure cold air and cold water. It also may undoubtedly be produced by any sudden change that causes what is called a shock. Nature loves change, but abhors suddenness and violence of change. This axiom may be carried to political and religious, as well as to physiological matters.

If there be no truth in the theory about people never having the same disease twice, it might be curious to find out the causes of the superstition. Possibly it may have to do with the old idea of curing by taking a hair of the dog that bites you.

A hair of the
dog that
bites you.

Lemnius says that the bite of a scorpion will cure the bite of a scorpion.

Now I can imagine that very little confusion of mind would be necessary to argue from this supposed fact, that small-pox will be a safeguard against small-pox.

But there is another explanation of the existence of the theory.

It is the principal prop on which Vaccination rests—what many people call the gigantic Vaccination swindle. I do not call it so ; for it is a very harsh term to apply to a deception that is caused in such a great degree by the unconscious bias of people who have an enormous pecuniary interest at stake.

Vaccination's
chief prop.

Dr. Thompson says that, unlike fevers, colds, the more frequently they recur, the more frequently they may be expected. But why draw a line, where there is no line, between colds and fevers ? Perhaps every cold is accompanied by some fever and may develope sometimes into one eruptive complaint, sometimes into another. Of course I know about the germ theory, but I am coming to that presently.

A man has a cold accompanied with feverishness, He gets slightly worse ; a little eruption comes on the skin and the complaint is called “chicken pox.” A little more eruption still, and it is called small-pox. According to the doctors, if the case had stopped at feverishness or chicken-pox, the patient would be subject to it again ; but not after it reached the stage of small-pox. But where do they draw the line ? Nature draws none.

Almost all medical men tell us, that a person will not have the same disease twice ; but a few years ago, they told us that everybody should be bled at spring and autumn ; that mercury should be taken in great quantities for almost everything ; that inoculation, which is now penal, was the right thing ;

and that Vaccination in infancy, infallibly secured people from small-pox for life.

The fact is, till medicine is a science, the public will, and must, doubt the truth of what they are told.

All the so-called proofs of the theory I am discussing would, in an exact science, be looked upon as simply childish.

Till others are presented to me, I shall continue to believe with Dr. H. Maudesley, that "any tissue which has been subject to a particular morbid action, is more likely to take on that action again," and that having had a complaint once, creates a slight tendency to have it again. Of course, I, myself, have no proof of this, but, at any rate, there is analogy. In other things, habit causes a tendency to repetition.

CHAPTER IV.

MEDICINE NOT YET A SCIENCE.

“Science, indeed ! It is nothing like a science.”—DR. MAJENDIE.

I SAY, medicine is not a science. I gather this from the words of eminent physicians in different countries.

Medicine not
a science.

The celebrated Dr. Majendie says, “medicine is a great humbug.” Also, “our ignorance of the real nature of disease is gross. Science, indeed ! It is nothing like science. Nobody knows anything about medicine. We are collecting facts, and, perhaps, in a century, there may be a science.”

Opinion of
eminent
medical
men.

Sir Astley Cooper says, “the science of medicine is founded on conjecture, and improved by murder.

Sir J. Forbes says, “that in a large majority of cases, diseases are cured by nature in spite of the doctors.”

Sir J. Forbes.

Dr. Barker says, “the drugs administered for scarlet fever, destroys far more than that disease does.”

Dr. Forth says, “there is scarcely a more dishonest trade imaginable than medicine.”

Professor Gregory says, “ninety-nine out of every hundred medical facts are medical lies, and medical doctrines are, for the most part, stark-staring nonsense.”

Professor
Gregory.

Dr. Thomas Watson says, "Our profession is continually floating on a sea of doubts about questions of the gravest importance."

Dr. Coggswell, of Boston, says, "were medicine abolished, mankind would be infinitely the gainers."

Dr. Frank says, "thousands are annually slaughtered in the sick room."

Dr. Mason Good says, "Medicine is a jargon, and has destroyed more than war, pestilence, and famine, combined."

These are a few opinions I have taken at random from the writings of eminent medical men.

Considerations on the other side.

But it would be unjust to withhold one or two considerations on the other side of the question.

In the first place, though Dr. Mason Good is, no doubt, right when he says that medicine has destroyed more than war, pestilence, and famine put together, we must remember that it has, undoubtedly, saved great numbers of lives, if only from the curative and life-giving influence of faith and hope, inspired by the mere presence of "the doctor," even where his remedies may have been pernicious.

Again, though past and present generations have suffered, it may be only in order that future ones may be the gainers. Success in anything can only be bought by failure. If in medicine this failure involves the sacrifice of human life, that is only its misfortune, necessarily arising from the nature of the pursuit; the rule must hold good. Knowledge must be paid for. A patient is killed by a new drug; but medical science is enriched by the dis-

covery of the action of that drug. A Faraday or a Davy blows himself up ; but a new and valuable explosive compound is given to the world.

The nonconformists who trust to nature alone have, no doubt, hitherto saved thousands of lives ; but the conformists, by their experimentalizations, will, perhaps, discover some drugs that, at some future time, may save millions of lives.

Why is it that medicine is so far behind all the other sciences ? Why is it that medicine is still in the regions of hypothesis, whilst all other sciences have learned to depend upon facts ? Why is it that medicine still rests upon superstitious or supposed facts that only exist in the imaginations of fanciful men ? as, for instance, that the zymotic or filth diseases are caused by the blood fermenting like malt, or that every complaint is produced by its own separate fungus or animalcule, which, according to Dr. Angus Smith, is exactly the two hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred millionth part of an inch in size—a minute malignant being, incessantly roaming about the world for the purpose of spreading death and destruction.

Why is medicine so far behind other sciences ?

Dr. Angus Smith.

The human intelligence, in its earlier stages, always believes that natural phenomena, such as the running of streams and growing of plants, are each caused by its own separate Dryad or Naiad, or invisible living being.

Astronomy was in this stage a thousand years ago, when the stars were believed to revolve every day round the earth, each one being pushed along by its own separate angel.

Astronomy.

Geology. Geology was in this stage a few years afterwards, when it was believed that the rotation of the earth round its own axis was caused by the souls of the damned turning it round like squirrels in a rotatory cage.

Chemistry. Chemistry was in the same stage, when philosophers believed in an imaginary substance which would convert everything into gold.

Religion was in the same stage, when all the affairs of this world were supposed to be conducted by evil spirits. We read that Luther constantly heard them making a noise in the cloisters, and, in fact, got quite accustomed to them. But, one night, being awakened by rather more noise than usual, he looked up to ascertain what was the matter; but, perceiving it was only the Devil, he turned round and went to sleep again. He was extremely fond of children; but, on one occasion, he recommended that a sick child should be thrown into the river and drowned, because it was possessed by the Devil. In those days, people deriving their beliefs from their imaginations, instead of from facts, thought that all diseases were caused by invisible malignant spirits. In these days, the belief is, that they are caused by invisible malignant animaleulæ, which are so small, as to be undiscoverable by any of the senses, even with the aid of the most perfect instruments. The form of superstition has changed, but the degree is surely the same.

Dr. Angus
Smith.

Dr. Angus Smith has written a very clever and interesting work, entitled, "Air and Rain." At pages 491 and 501, he states that no germ of disease

has ever been seen or discovered. Then, at page 504, he says, that germs of disease do exist, and that each one is the two hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred millionth of an inch in size. Now, this is very entertaining, but surely it cannot be called science—and, in fact, he says just afterwards, that some people consider them to be a great many million sizes less still.

No, first catch these creatures in the very act of imparting disease. When caught, measure them. Let competent scientific authorities agree about both the alleged misdemeanour and the measurement. Then, and not till then, will the theory emerge from the regions of dreams and superstition, and enter upon the stage of exact science.

Surely, when we see the fatal effects of some gases, such as carbonic oxide, which has not even any smell, it would be more reasonable to attribute diseases to foul vapours, than to invisible corporal imaginations.

Why does the public believe that the moon is 237,000 miles from the earth? Simply because astronomers are agreed about it.

At page 544, Mr. Angus Smith states that the germ theory is nothing but a speculation.

At page 515, I see the statement, that in places where marsh miasm exists, the deaths are more numerous than the births. But can this statement be called exact science? I know perfectly well, that when the elder Mr. Weller is warning his son against matrimony, and especially against the danger of widows, he makes the statement, that more

“widders is married than single women.” But Mr. Weller was a coachman, and made no pretensions to science.

Why is medicine 100 years behind the sciences?

Again, I say, why is medicine a hundred years behind the other sciences? Why is it still founded on imaginations, guesses, and superstition? Causes are always complex, but one or two may be suggested.

In the first place, then, in the other sciences, there is no temptation to encourage false theories; so truth and facts pay best. In medicine, truth does not pay best immediately, and so truth and facts go to the wall. He only should blame the doctors who is certain that he, in their place, would do otherwise. The temptation must be enormous. I have often been astonished, considering this, how honest the doctors are. With whom is it that they have to do? They have to deal with, not the healthy majority of mankind, who love truth; but the feeble, the diseased, and the insane minority—in fact, that part of the community whose understandings, undermined by illness, in slavery to all the fears and morbid imaginings of disease, hate wholesome truth, and are eager to pay enormously for every kind of consolatory falsehood that flatters their fancies and encourages them in their unhealthy beliefs and superstitions. Demand in this world always produces supply. If patients demand false and exaggerated ideas about infection and other things, the supply is sure to be forthcoming.

If any one is inclined to blame the doctors, let him try for a time what it feels like, to be struggling through life, with a wife and large family, on perhaps, one hundred pounds a year.

Sidney Smith says, "many a man thinks it Sidney Smith virtue that keeps him from roguery, when it is nothing but a full stomach. One should be careful not to mistake potatoes for principles."

Where the temptation to humbug is so enormous disinterested honesty, when we do meet it, becomes admirable.

A friend of mine, meeting his doctor one morning, said, "I was nearly sending for you last night, I felt so seedy; but I thought I would sleep upon it, and I am all right this morning."

"My dear sir," said the doctor, "I must beg of Anecdote. you most earnestly never to do such a thing again. Such a practice, if it became general, would be fatal—to the profession; for, if every one acted on that principle, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the doctor would never be wanted at all."

One other reason why medicine is so far behind the other sciences.

Other sciences have to do with matter. Medicine has to do with mind, as well as matter.

Few realize the degree to which mind acts upon matter. A hypnotized person is made to believe his hand is becoming burning hot. It actually does become so. A few minutes afterwards, he is made to believe that it is becoming cold, and icy cold to the touch it does actually become.

Effects of
mind on
matter.

A sea-sick man at sea hears a fiddle played by a sailor. For years afterwards he never can hear a fiddle without being sick.

A man so weak that he can hardly lift a twenty-eight pound weight with both his hands, is made to believe that he can take it up with his little finger and swing it round his head. He accordingly does it with the greatest ease.

Many people can fix their attention upon one arm until it becomes cataleptic.

Dr. Carpenter says, that if a man, for some reason, really thinks a perfectly easy thing to be impossible, it immediately becomes to him impossible, from his want of faith.

Every single thing that men consciously do, they do because they believe they can do it; because they have faith.

Thus science is at last finding out the truth of what inspired insight discovered 1800 years ago, that "whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, *believing*, ye shall receive." The strong oriental figure of speech, "if ye have faith, and shall say unto this mountain, be thou removed and cast into the sea, it shall be done," teaches the same thing.

Mr. Darwin.

Mr. Darwin says, that when attention is drawn to any part of the body, there is a tendency to alteration of the small arteries of that part; also, that certain glands are much influenced by thinking of them.

Sir B. Brodie.

Sir B. Brodie believes that pain may be felt in any part of the body to which attention is closely drawn.

A healthy woman sees a man with a paralyzed arm. This has such an effect upon her mind, that her own arm becomes paralyzed.

Brodie says, that a joint will sometimes become thoroughly diseased from nothing in the world but imagination, and the mind being directed towards it.

A man has his eyes bandaged, and the skin on his arm is slightly pricked with a pin. A stream of warm water is made to trickle from the place. The man faints or dies from thinking of the blood he is losing.

A man is sentenced to death. At the last moment, with his head on the block, and the axe about to fall, a reprieve comes. It is too late, the man is already dead.

For some reason, a man thinks he will die at a particular moment. When that moment comes, he actually does die.

A man dreams that he has received a violent blow in some particular place. When he wakes there is actually a bruise at that place, or injury so great that suppuration takes place.

A person expects to go to sleep or to awake at a particular time. He does so.

A French surgeon tries an experiment in a hospital. He gives one hundred patients some sugar and water. He then pretends to be full of alarm, in consequence of having made a mistake and given them all an emetic. In a few minutes eighty of them are actually sick.

A French soldier is tripped up by a spent cannon ball, but without its doing him the slightest harm, Anecdote.

He thinks both his legs are carried off, and lies on the ground all night, suffering actually excruciating bodily agony, and never moving for fear of encouraging the bleeding. Next morning, the medical officer coming round says to him, "Qu'a-t-il mon comarade?" "Ah," says he, "touchez moi doucement je vous prie. Un coup de canon m'a emporté les jambes."

A ship is threatened with instant destruction. One of the crew, a healthy young Dane, is so terrified, that he falls speechless, and red bloody perspiration breaks out all over him.

Dr. D. Tuke says, "that mental emotion may, in a brief space of time, induce death in perfectly healthy people, is a fact freely admitted by science."

A lady out walking, saw a child's ankle crushed by a gate. The effect upon her mind was such, that she immediately experienced great pain in her own ankle. She could hardly walk home, and when she took off her stocking, she found a circle round the ankle, as if it had been painted with red currant juice. Next morning the whole foot was inflamed, and she was unable to walk for days.

Hair has often been known to turn quickly grey from mental emotion.

A doctor lecturing, gives a vivid and graphic description of ague. One of the students is seized with ague on the spot.

Sir Samuel Baker, describing the fever in Africa, says, that violent emotion, like anger or grief, is almost certain to be followed by the fever of the country.

An Indian Fakir can at will throw his body into a trance that lasts for weeks.

Brodie mentions a young lady with a diseased hip joint. Nothing did her good. At last, one day she providentially fell off her donkey. The mental emotion this caused completely cured her.

Dr. J. Brown, of Edinbro', wrote a prescription for an ignorant labouring man, and told him to take it. The man accordingly swallowed the piece of paper itself, and was cured. His faith cured him.

Hippocrates says, "faith is all, and that physician Hippocrates. cures most who can best get people to believe in him." Thus, no doubt, the quack who is most dogmatic and most certain, where certainty is impossible, will often be more successful than the respectable members of the profession, who do not, in this way, work upon the faith and imaginations of their patients.

Sir Humphrey Davy placed a thermometer under Sir Humphrey Davy. the tongue of a paralytic man, merely to ascertain the temperature. But the man thought it was some remedial operation, and professed himself and appeared better, so it was repeated every day for a fortnight, when the man was cured.

To give one more instance of the influence of mind over body, we have Shakespear's authority that care once killed a cat.

People without intuition, or common sense, however clever they may be, never know what to believe. They generally believe what is false, and and disbelieve what is true.

Correct intuition comes from the rapid unconscious action of all a man's faculties, when they are symmetrical,—actions that it is impossible to trace, and that cease the moment any attempt is made to trace them.

In reference to the above stories, which I have mostly found in Dr. Tuke's book, I may say that the easiest thing for a man to do who has no intuition, or who is otherwise puzzle-pated, is to deny the truth of everything that he has not seen himself. And, undoubtedly, this principle is largely acted on. In fact, a man with absolutely nothing in him but a critical understanding, *cannot* believe, simply because he has nothing to believe with. Reason alone cannot believe any more than it can hate or love, or taste a taste. To talk to a man with nothing in him but logic, about honesty in the narrator of a remarkable story, is idle. A man with neither honesty nor dishonesty in himself, does not know what the word honesty means.

The above stories are merely a few stray ones selected out of innumerable others of a similar nature, which have in all times been believed in by the common sense of mankind in general, and disbelieved in by those who are without the capacity to believe anything that is unusual. Everything in the world is miraculous to the man who goes deep enough, but many of the above cases are simply

Miracles. miracles in the ordinary sense of the term. That is to say, they are contrary to ordinary experience. They are contrary to what are supposed to be the uniform laws of the universe.

Dr. Garth Wilkinson goes so far as to say, that all disease is caused by spiritual deficiencies. That is to say, by want of life, joy, love, hope, and faith, all which he, as well as Ruskin and Gœthe, seem to consider only different forms of the same thing.

Dr. Daniel Tuke says, that Joy, Faith, and Hope are the most valuable of all medicines ; also, that joy produces an immediate effect upon the stomach and liver. He tells us the following stories :—

A young lady suffered from ague of long standing. No remedies were of any avail. At length her brother, to whom she was much attached, returned home, and she was well. Joy cured her.

Mr. Andrew Cross was bitten by a mad cat. After a time, the usual symptoms of hydrophobia showed themselves ; intense pain in the bitten arm, horror of water, &c. But he was a man of a strong mind, and he determined to fight the disease. By power of his will, he turned his attention to other things ; went out shooting. in spite of the intense pain which he suffered, and so compelled his mind away from himself, that the symptoms gradually subsided, and in a few days he was well. In this way he worked a miracle upon himself. His mental energy cured him.

Sir Henry Holland says, that many years ago, he has known cases amongst silly fashionable women in London, where a ticket for Almack's has cured diseased states, which had baffled the most skilful physicians.

A French girl was separated from her mother, who was in a hospital. In vain she begged to be

taken back to her. In a short time she was seized with delirium, headache, and paralysis, so that she could not stand. Drugs, seetons, leeches, and bleeding, did no good. At length she became so bad that she was taken to the hospital where her mother was. Unable to walk, she was carried to her mother's bed. She threw herself upon her neck, covered her with tears and kisses, and seemed as if she could not caress her enough. From that moment she was perfectly cured. But it was not the drugs that cured her.

These stories illustrate the effect the mind may have upon the body.

On the other hand, when the effect of the body on the mind is considered also, the complexity becomes infinite.

Voltaire said that the massacre of Saint Bartholomew was occasioned by the king's stomach being out of order.

Massacre of
St. Bar-
tholomew.

Again, when we consider that every human being is born with a constitution different from every human being who was ever born before, or will be born hereafter; considering, also, that in consequence of this difference, added to the infinite difference in surrounding circumstances, no two cases of illness ever have been, or can be, exactly alike—I say, considering these things, can it be wondered at that doctors have now and then been known to differ, or that medicine is not yet an exact science.

One more hint.

Doctors have mostly to do with the female part of the population. Therefore, hard-headed reason

and rigid logic are not exactly the things most in demand on the part of the majority of their patients. I am not talking about real superiority of one sex or the other, but only about reason.

If Swedenborg is right, that women represent Swedenborg. moral excellence, and men intellectual excellence, women are, I need not say, superior ; for, of course, Christianity is right, as opposed to Aristotle, and all Paganism, past, present, and to come, in looking upon intellectual excellence as nothing, when compared to moral excellence.* No doubt Mahomet

* Which is the superior sex, is a question much discussed, but little settled. Gœthe says, “ that person is greatest who is happiest and causes most happiness, Now, Dr. Johnson says, that conversation causes more happiness than anything else. If, then, Gœthe and Johnson are both right, the question between the sexes may be considered settled ; for, that more conversation takes place amongst women than amongst men, is undoubted. In fact, the interests of men are generally, more than is the case with women, confined to one subject, to which they perhaps devote almost every moment of their lives. We read of a great grammarian, who regretted that he had frittered away his whole life, by spreading his studies over too large a field, that, namely, of general grammar, instead of confining his attention solely to the accusative case. Now, this man was very likely a great benefactor to the human race, but in the matter of conversation he must, one would think, have found a difficulty in meeting with reciprocity of interests.

As I say, a man's interests are generally in some *one thing*, whereas a woman's interests are in *many persons*.

A business man, in America, was travelling on a steamboat with his wife and family. When he came to his place of disembarkation, he collected his traps to go on shore, but something was missing ; he could not recollect what it was. He counted everything carefully, over and over again. Ten boxes, six packages, and a portmanteau. Still there was something missing. At length the

Mahomet. denied that women have souls. The conclave of cardinals only gave them souls by a majority of one ; and the Scotch Presbyterians proved the same thing by the verse in the Revelations, which says, " and there was silence in heaven for the space of half-an-hour." But, on the other hand, Mahomet was a man : and, therefore, his opinion was one-sided. The cardinals, though, probably enough, old women in one sense, were strictly speaking, no doubt, men too ; and the Scotch Presbyterian, of course, was a man.

Have women
souls ?

Christopher
North.

Christopher North says, " Women superior to men ! of course they are ; though not in intellect, thank God."

As I have said above, doctors have mostly to do with the female part of the population.

Mr. Punch on
medicine.

Our friend, Mr. Punch, who hits nails on the head better than most people, gives an amusing list, in two columns of ideas that are fixed in the mind, first of man, then of woman. He says man's fixed ideas are :—

- (1) That he is over-worked.
- (2) That his constitution requires stimulants.
- (3) That smoking is good for his nerves.
- (4) That he knows a good glass of wine.
- (5) That medicine is all humbug.

And so on through the whole list.

captain's patience was exhausted, and he said, " Wall now, come, I can't wait no longer, so go and fetch your wife and children out of the cabin." " Darn it, them's 'um," said the man. " I knowed there was somethin."

Now, anything like this could not have happened to a woman.

Of course, woman has her fixed ideas also :—

- (1) That she has nothing to put on.
- (2) That she never goes out anywhere.
- (3) That she requires a change about the month of August.
- (4) That cook drinks.
- (5) That her best black silk is getting awfully shabby.
- (6) That the doctor must be sent for.

And so through *her* whole list.

The fact is, almost every man has his joke against medicine, and the doctors have only themselves to thank for it. They have brought this universal contempt of their profession on themselves, by their persistent encouragement of obsolete superstitions and senseless practices, for the sake (whether consciously or unconsciously) of pecuniary gain.

I have alluded to the enormous profits both conformist and non-conformist quackery sometimes have realized. Enormous profits of quackery.

When Dr. Dimsdale, in 1768, inoculated the Empress of Russia and her son, neither of whom seem to have died in consequence of it, he was rewarded with a fee of £12,000, a pension for life, and the rank of Baron. Illustrative instances.

Inoculation in England is now penal.

Sir E. King received £1,000 for bleeding Charles II.

A French lady was killed by clumsy bleeding. On her death-bed she left the operator £800, on condition that he never bled anyone again as long as he lived.

In England, a man in what is called an exalted position contracts a dangerous illness. A distinguished physician saves his life by clever negative treatment. If he had not attended, the treatment would not have been negative, and the patient would have died.* The physician's fees are large, and he deserves them. In addition to this, he is allowed to use before his name, for the rest of his life, a short word of one syllable.

General Fo. Not long ago, in China, a general of the name of Fo much distinguished himself, whereupon the Emperor issued the following decree:—"Fo has done well; let him have a peacock's feather."

Titles. In France, when anyone does some grand and heroic action, or in any way distinguishes himself very highly, a grateful nation permits him to put a little bit of red ribbon into one of the button-holes of his frock coat; and he usually avails himself of this permission.

I gather from Artemus Ward, and other Americans who ought to know, that even enlightened citizens of the United States do not always hide their designations of colonel and general under a bushel.

Scratch a Russian, says the saying, and the Tartar appears underneath. Scratch a democrat or a monarchist, and I am sadly afraid that poor old

* Not long ago, a London physician visited a patient in the country. He pronounced the case "inflammation of the heart." The country doctor expressed his regret at not having discovered it. "Pray do not distress yourself," was the answer, "it is all for the best. You might, perhaps, have treated it."

human nature appears underneath in the one just as well as in the other.

People with republican proclivities protest against titles. I think such people are wrong. It is good for a country when its citizens are industrious and zealous. But without some rewards, they will be so in only a limited degree. As human nature is constituted, men value titles, bits of red ribbons in button holes, or peacocks' feathers, as the case may be ; and it is fortunate they do so, otherwise some expensive rewards would be necessary, causing a great increase to the taxation.

Penalties for wrong doing are not sufficient. There should be rewards as well.

A creole planter described to a traveller his system with his slaves. It was a system of re-
Rewards and
punishments
wards and punishments. He said, "if they no work, they be flog ; dat is de punishment. If they work very hard indeed, they be no flog ; dat is de reward." Now this system, practically of only punishments, may have answered on that plantation, but I cannot think it applicable to large civilized communities.

Those who are democratically inclined, always in their talk about equality ignore the constitution of human nature as it actually is. Everybody, unless age or utilitarianism has deadened his faculties, is always either looking up or looking down. If an advanced Liberal finds himself in presence of a person he feels to be his superior, down he is at once upon the knees of his soul before him, just like anyone else. On the other hand, if

Equality.

he is in presence of some poor imbecile drunkard, all the liberty, equality, and fraternity in the world cannot prevent him from looking down upon him with either pity or contempt, or both. His being a free and independent citizen of some enlightened republic makes no difference whatever. He may say to himself, he will look up to and look down upon no one, but he can say so only by ignoring the laws of human nature as they are constituted. A boy may say to himself, he will not care for the whipping he knows to be due, but he can say so only by ignoring the laws of sensation, as they are constituted. When it comes to the point, he screams, and promises to be good for the term of his natural life, just like any other boy.

Hereditary
legislators.

Although I can truly say with Artemus Ward, "I am not a politician, and my other habits are good," I cannot help observing here, that I am not standing up for inequalities, after circumstances that produced them have changed, such as, to give an instance, hereditary legislation. The end of hereditary legislation will very possibly be, that the hereditary legislators will refuse to legislate hereditarily. It must be very painful to an active-minded, well-educated, and talented Englishman who wishes, as most such men do, to exercise some influence for good, to find himself, in the very prime of his existence, prevented from doing so by being shut up for life in the House of Lords; and, as I say, it must not surprise us, if some day our hereditary legislators were to imitate the example that is so largely set them at the present day, and strike.

To return to negative medical treatment. We have had an instance of its value lately.

The *Times* tells us, that Sir H. Bulwer always Sir H. Bulwer. had in his establishment a Greek doctor, whose account of his own duties was as follows:—"Ma tâche journalière c'est de l'empêcher de prendre de la médecine." Sir Henry was a delicate man, and, I have no doubt, owed many years of his life to his Greek doctor.

Negative treatment is, perhaps, the most important, and, certainly, by far the most difficult branch of medicine. Anybody can write a prescription, but to prevent patients, their friends, and servants from doing foolish things is, in most cases, more than difficult; it is impossible.

We all know that very severe things are, and always have been, said about medicine. Severe things said against Vaccination.

Mr. Saxbey said to Akenside, the poet and physician, "the ancients tried to make medicine a science, and failed; the moderns to make it a trade, and succeeded."

Formerly, in the Duchy of Wurtemberg, when the Calcraft, or public executioner of the day, had sent out of the world a sufficiently large number of people, he was popularly dignified with the degree of doctor of physic. Instances of this.

Under the old bleeding and violent modes of treatment, the common thing to say when a new doctor set up in the town was, that the church-yard would have to be enlarged.

In the olden times, the abbey had a bleeding house, where the sacred inmates periodically underwent bleeding to the strains of Psalmody.

The old epitaph says, "I was well, I wished to be better, I took physic, and here I am."

This is supposed to be an English epitaph, but a friend of mine saw it in Italian on a tombstone at Florence.

Some proverbs and epigrams, in consequence of their obvious truth, arise spontaneously in different countries, without being copied one from the other. As an instance, the well-known proverb, "Hunger is the best sauce," is said to be found in all languages.

The story of the old doctor, beseeching his medical attendant on his death-bed not to give him any physic, but to let him die a natural death, is also met with everywhere. The fact is, it is so natural a thing to be said, under the circumstances, that it very often has been said.

Allopathy is dying away, says the *Quarterly Review*. The same Review disposes effectually of the doctrine held by old-fashioned doctors that the constitution of the human race has altered since they were young, and that this accounts for patients in these days wanting feeding, instead of bleeding. It is naturally painful for old folks to confess they have been wrong all their lives.

Now, when doctors tell us that although these severe things that have been said of medicine were true, for those ignorant times, but that now the world is enlightened, we must remember that, though some improvement can hardly be doubted, this is only what almost all people naturally think about their own times in everything. Emerson

says, that before Napoleon's time, the belief was universal in Europe, that the art of war had arrived at the utmost perfection, of which it was capable. And yet these were the days of the old flint gun.

I once read in some American work, the name of which I do not remember, an account of a man shooting a squirrel with one of these old flint guns. He pulled the trigger, but the gun was so long going off, that he took it from his shoulder and looked down the barrel to see if anything was wrong ; but it was all right ; and he had only just time to say, "Darn it, its coming," and put the machine to his shoulder again, when out the charge came, and down dropped the squirrel.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

I must protest against the common practice of accusing the medical profession of weaknesses, follies, and dishonesties, which, even where true, they only share with the majority of mankind, and which are true—not because they are doctors, but because they are men of merely the average stamp. It is given only to a small minority of mankind to possess much original insight into truth, in complicated matters.

Even where the leaders of medical thought are to blame, the majority of the profession are but as sheep that are led astray.

Every truth on every side of a question should be known, and its proper weight in the balance carefully considered ; so it would be wrong to pass over the enormous mortality that must, according to the opinions of medical men, have been

Fearful mor-
tality caus-
ed by the art
of healing-

occasioned in all times by the practice of healing. Merely to give one instance, we read, that up to almost the present time, the old mode of treating dysentery in Bengal killed eighty-eight out of every thousand ; whereas by the present treatment, only thirteen out of every thousand die.

On the other hand, we must remember the saying, that “the way to do right is to do wrong ;” and that, as in the life of an individual, failure must precede success, so in the history of medicine killing must precede curing.

Another consideration.

Surgery.

Whatever doubts there may be about the present state of medicine, and whatever suffering may have been caused by the surgery of the past, at the present time surgery is almost an unmitigated blessing to the human race. I am not, of course, speaking of the surgery still found in country towns and districts, but real first-class surgery.

Again, I say, that whilst the ignorance, humbug, extortion, and charlatanry of doctors, in all times, and of all medical sects, whether conformist or non-conformist, is of course undeniable, it would be unjust to ignore the other side of the question—how the ignorance that killed was qualified by the kind-heartedness that consoled whilst it killed—how the humbug was only a highly remunerated supply, necessarily forthcoming to answer an enormous demand—and how extortion has been set off by a noble generosity and unostentatious charity, for which, in all times, the members of the medical profession have been distinguished.

Noble generosity of doctors.

Abernethy said to a half-pay lieutenant he had attended for a long time, and who at last hinted something about payment, "wait till you are a general, and then we'll talk of the fees." Illustrative
Anecdotes.

To a poor widow, whose child he had long attended, and whose fees he had taken, thinking her rich, he returned the whole of it on finding out the truth.

Dr. Glynn, of Cambridge, went miles every day in his carriage to attend the son of a poor peasant woman, knowing well her inability to make any payment. A few days after the last visit, the woman again presented herself at his door, carrying a large basket. She said to him, "we can't get no rest for thinking of all your trouble and kindness, so my boy resolved on sending you his favorite magpie." Then she opened the basket, and out he hopped.

But the stories of the generosity of doctors would fill volumes.

Another thing we must not forget. That although the modes of cure hitherto in use have killed millions, as we have seen from the writings of eminent medical men, still the young, and those with naturally strong constitutions, very often passed through the ordeal in safety, and even with little or no permanent injury.

Speaking of charlatans, I have no doubt that the great charlatans of history, humbugs, as they were, have not generally been nearly so fatal as the regular practitioners. In fact, perhaps, the true explanation of their success is, that at the bottom of humbug they usually trusted to nature. Charlatans.
Why successful.

The most celebrated charlatan in history, perhaps, **Paracelsus.** is Paracelsus, who, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, commenced his mode of practice, in consequence of honestly dissenting from the violent remedies prevalent, which, he said, resulted in nothing but murdering. Later on in life he went mad about the magnet and the stars.

Van Helmont After him came Van Helmont, who was mad about the power of the will. He said that a man can kill an animal by his will and his eye. He quotes one Rousseau, who tried to kill a toad in this way, but the toad turned the tables on him, and stared at Rousseau so fiercely that he fainted, and could only be brought round by treacle and the powder of vipers. Still this proved the power of the eye.

Another charlatan was Gassner, a clergyman. His mode of practice was to dress himself in a scarlet cloak, stand opposite the patient, and order the disease to depart. He always spoke in Latin, in order that the devil might understand him.

In 1743, Cagliostro was born. He professed to possess the secret of prolonging life. At last the inquisition seized him, and, in spite of his protest that he had never had anything to do with the devil, condemned him to perpetual imprisonment.

Dr. Katterfelto. About 1782, Dr. Katterfelto travelled about the country with a number of black cats and a nostrum made of powdered toads, worms, adders, and bats. But neither the nostrum nor the cats did any harm. He left his patients really to nature, killed few, and so compared with the orthodox practitioners, was, no doubt, very successful.

Dr. Graham, about 1780, got a great name. Dr. Graham.

He filled up with every possible luxury and ornamentation which he called "The Temple of Health," where the senses were charmed by music, scents, spices burned in swinging censers, and in every conceivable manner, a fair and frail young lady who, afterwards became the notorious Lady Hamilton officiating. An elixir of life was vended for £100 paid in advance, and a celestial bed with costly draperies provided for the childless at £100 a night.

But these things were nothing but harmless clap trap. He really cured great numbers of people, for he preached cleanliness, temperance, open windows, cold water, and early hours.

After him came St. John Long, a plausible Irish- St. John Long man, who made a great fortune. His remedies for everything seem to have been a small blister and a large cabbage leaf.

A similar explanation accounts for the success of most Nostrums and Quackeries, they did no harm, and saved those who had recourse to them from the regular practitioner.

At one time, fustigation was all the rage, the Fustigation. regular written formular for patients was "flageletur frequenter et fortiter." But it did no harm.

CHAPTER V.

INFECTION.

"Few diseases have not been thought to be infectious, as for instance, ophthalmia, ague, &c., &c. I shall not be surprised, if broken bones be added to the list, for in medicine, nothing is too absurd to be believed."—DR. S. DICKSON.

"True nursing ignores infection ; cleanliness and proper ventilation are all a nurse needs for protection."—MISS NIGHTINGALE.

I HAVE alluded to the foolish and exaggerated fears that prevail about infection.

A very eminent physician, whose experience was enormous, once told me he did not believe in infection. Some ladies came into the room, and he immediately began talking to them of the extreme precautions it was necessary to take against infection.

Hear a doctor talk and you must think he believes in infection. Consider what he does and you can no longer think that he believes one word about it ; for he passes his life going from diseased to healthy persons in a way that, if a tenth of what he says were true, would spread death wherever he went. If a twentieth part of what he says were true, there would not be a doctor or a nurse left alive in England. I know very well that the common thing to say is, that they get into the habit of being exposed to infection without being the worse for it ; but this is as if a soldier, after a campaign, were to say he sur-

vived because he got into the habit of being hit by bullets without being the worse for it. Whatever truth there may be in infection, according to the ordinary ideas of the word, the degree is perhaps incapable of proof. But of this there is no doubt ; the more ignorant people are, the more they believe in it. Uncultivated people cannot believe in the sufficiency of filth to cause disease.

In the middle ages, it was believed that the black Black death. death was caused by Jews poisoning the wells, and the Jews were slaughtered accordingly. In later times, in Italy, the population believed the cholera was caused by the doctors, and the doctors were pulled to pieces accordingly.

The ignorant labouring classes of this country are utterly unable to believe in any cause of disease amongst sheep and cattle, except their being, to use their own word, "smitten."

Bad and idle horse management makes horses Crib-bite. crib-bite. The stupid lazy grooms who have caused it say that one horse must have caught it from another.

Boys at school get measles from a stopped-up drain or a bad ventilated room. The ignorant doctor says one boy caught it from another.

The last cattle plague was a puzzle to stupid Cattle plague. people, so they sent the puzzle to Russia and called it solved. In Russia, the same puzzle existed, so there they sent it to another country and called it solved.

All through human things there is the same Spontaneity. strange unwillingness to believe in spontaneity.

Look at critics and their perpetual striving to deny originality and accuse of plagiarism. They well know, I suppose, that the few ideas they have in their own heads were only got there through much tribulation from other sources, so they cannot believe in ideas ever coming in any other way.*

* Whilst standing up for the originality and spontaneity there is in the world, we must not shut our eyes to the other side of the question. It cannot be denied that the third class writers are absolutely dependent for their ideas upon other minds ; repeating as they do in endlessly varied phraseology, trite, commonplace, or old traditional ideas, some of which never were true, whilst others have long ceased to be so. I will give one or two illustrations of this, for every argument or statement should have its illustration. It does not strengthen the proof, but it helps to realize it to the imagination. If everybody was a high mathematician, illustrations, perhaps, should never be used, but as very few people are mathematicians at all, they should be used.

French writers about England are never tired of repeating Voltaire's theory about English spleen producing annually large crops of suicides every November, but facts show that the English do not kill themselves nearly as much as the French, and those who do, seldom do it in November.

English newspaper writers of the present day unceasingly repeat their little jokes, not ad vanseum, for harmless blunders cause amusement not sickness, but ad indibrinm or ad mentis delectationem about "the stupid country party," "the bucolic mind," &c. But railways have long ago done away with the isolation of country life. Thus, Professor De Morgan says, "there is now no class more highly educated, more broadly educated, and more deeply educated, than those who were in old times best described as "partridge popping squireens."

Some believe that, for the perfection of health and strength of body and mind, country life is, as a rule, almost necessary.

The Authoress of *George Geith* calls town people sharp and shallow.

Isaac Taylor talks of town life producing irritability of temperament, which destroys health of body and real strength of mind.

A has cholera, B has cholera in the next village about the same time. Doctor C says B caught it from A. The fact is, a Doctor must say something, for if he says nothing, it would look as if he knew nothing about it, and that, of course, would never do.

George Eliot talks of town life producing "thinness" of mind and of character, like run-up trees in an over-crowded plantation.

Sidney Smith, writing a letter of excuse after coming to London "from the country says, "I have got into all my London feelings, "which come on immediately I pass Hyde Park Corner. I am "heartless, selfish, insolent, worldly frivolous, &c. Pardon the vices "inevitable in the greatest of cities." Of course, he wrote in joke, still there is truth beneath the joke.

Most people must have witnessed how a course of London fashionable life will often bring on in poor silly women the kind of moral idiotism expressed by Sidney Smith's epithets; and, where the heart goes the head will not be far behind, however active the brain may appear to be. People talk of a clever rogue, but "clever" and "rogue" or "clever" and "bad," are really contradictory. A man is *one*. A part cannot deteriorate without the whole, and every other part deteriorating also. All vice means, at bottom, general imbecility.

Frederick Robertson says, "my beau-ideal of a devil, is a Parisian woman thoroughly depraved and thoroughly refined."

We have read in newspapers lately a good deal about the deterioration morally, physically, and intellectually, that takes place in large towns. Many people think that a country cannot go on and prosper after once the town element in it has reached a certain preponderance; that effeminacy, weakness of every kind, the vice resulting from that weakness, want of self dependence, &c., must send such a country down hill. They quote ancient Italy and other once prosperous nations. No doubt these people may be right, but time alone can show. History teaches very little, for circumstances are endlessly novel. Compared with England at the present day, race, climate, customs, science, and religion, were all different.

Besides, it satisfies most people's minds more to give some explanation which they even know to be foolish, than to confess ignorance.

Formerly, people carried out their childish explanations in some cruel manner. If a man was ill, they burned a witch for being the cause of it. This is not the case at the present day, though the explanations are perhaps equally superstitious in their way.

The Zymatic
Diseases, by
Mr. Wolfe.

I read a little book lately which, for the first time, has led me to hope that some day medicine will be a science. The title of it is "The Zymatic Diseases," by Mr. Wolfe.

In it he says, "contagion in small-pox is always assumed, and superstitious modes of contagion are accepted as explanations, such as "driving in a cab which has carried a small-pox patient, or passing on the other side of the street, a person who had lately recovered from the complaint."

During the cattle plague, it was frequently maintained, in sober earnestness, that all dogs should be tied up, cats killed, little birds shot, and mosquito curtains put up in the cattle sheds. Still the propounders of these precautions were strangely inconsistent. With one voice they maintained that the Rinderpest was carried by dogs and cattle doctors, and yet, though they all agreed that the dogs should be tied up, I never once heard of anything being said about tying up the doctors.

I will here relate a little bit of experience of my own about a horse.

One day, going into the stable, I found one of my horses had two very bad broken knees. For a long time I was unable to account for this, but at length I heard that my groom had very incautiously put the animal up at a public house in the very next stall to a horse that was just recovering from broken knees, and was, in fact, in that most infectious stage of the complaint, when the skin was beginning to peel off the healed place.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

But this is buffoonery, says our old friend Dr. Dry-as-dust.

It is not buffonery. If such nonsensical proofs are allowed in argument as catching a disease from a person passing at the other side of the street, anything in the world can be proved, anything can be disproved, and search for truth becomes a farce.

Dr. O'Ryan, Dr. Haygarth, and others, have tried to infect children with small-pox in the open air, but without success.

Dr. O'Ryan
and Dr.
Haygarth.

During the cattle plague, I tried to infect my cows with it in the open air, but, of course, without success.

The perfection of superstitious folly was reached by the cow doctors, who accounted for the cattle plague in one place by the fact of a strong west wind bringing it from some beasts ten miles off.

But, upon my honour, I have heard almost as foolish things from our own doctors.

A simple-minded surgeon writes to the *Lancet* of June, 1872, expressing his surprise at numerous instances that have come under his notice of infants nursed throughout by mothers in bad small-pox

without catching it. Of course there is nothing very remarkable about the matter ; only it shows how cautious people ought to be in mistaking simple-minded credulity for dishonesty, for, in this case, the surprise expressed was evidently genuine.

Mr. Pratt, a surgeon, tells a story of a mother nursing her infant in the same bed with another child in confluent small-pox. She would not have it removed, declaring she would "tak nea harm, and she would not have the bit bairn fashed." Neither mother nor child caught the complaint, *although*, as he says, neither had been vaccinated. Many at the present time would say *because* neither had been vaccinated.

Mr. Pratt says he could give many such instances.

I read a few years ago, in a newspaper, some very clever letters written by a Dr. S. Dickson, who seems, as far as I can judge from a few letters, to be one of those exceptional men, who have the power of seeing relation between things and unity of principle where such exists.

He laughs at the germ theory, and says, that when a disease is prevalent anything may cause it ; a sudden chill, a depressing passion, or even a mechanical injury. He says, in "all times, people have tried "to make money out of the misery of their fellow-creatures.* The question of Infection is not free from

* There is perhaps according to one system of philosophy, nothing surprising in this. It is only the carrying out in human life of the laws that are observed to reign in the animal world, according to which, in the struggle for life, the strong and the cunning secure their own existence, by preying on the weak and imbecile. If one of the

“the principle. To meet the fact, that medical men
 “seldom fall victims to a disease, though constantly
 “exposed to it, it has been pretended that they
 “have immunity from that very circumstance. Few
 “diseases have not been thought to be infectious,
 “ophthalmia, ague, &c., &c. I shall not be surprised
 “if broken bones be added to the list, for in medi-
 “cine nothing is too absurd to be believed.”

Dr. Forbes Winslow's opinions seem to be similar to Dr. Dickson's. The former says, “mental
 “emotion and shock to nerves, may cause almost
 “any disease, and yet there are medical men who
 “will tell you that no complaint can be caused
 “without some subtle poison to the blood.”

Dr. Mandesley mentions cases of surgical opera-
 tions causing erysipelas. Another operation, he says,
 produced measles ; another, scarlet fever ; and ano-
 ther, small-pox.

Dr. Mandes-
 ley.

In studying medical theories about Infection, I am constantly being reminded of the cattle doctors, a few years ago, who, with one voice agreed, and in fact proved to the satisfaction of everybody, that the plague was first introduced into London cow-houses by cattle that had been brought from Russia into Revel by railway. At length upon *unprofessional* enquiry it turned out,—

deer in a park becomes sickly all the others set upon and kill it, thus securing for themselves its allowance of hay. This principle of sacrifice of others for the sake of oneself undoubtedly reigns amongst men just as it does amongst animals. When men reach a certain height it is changed for the christian principles, but few reach the height of acting on them as a habit of life, though most act on them more or less.

- (1) That there was no railway into Revel.
- (2) That the said cattle were all perfectly healthy.
- (3) That being all oxen they were certain never to be taken into cow-houses.
- (4) That they never went to London at all.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

During the cattle plague, my father, Sir George Cholmley, one day met a farmer, one of his tenants.

He said, well Mr. Thompson, I hope you have no disease amongst your things ?

Naw, Sir George, and I isn't gawin to neither.

Why, how can you tell that ?

Well, I'll tell you, Sir George ! I sent for Mr. Smith, the Vetennary Doctor, and he's coomed and clapped a rowel into every one on 'em, sheep and all. He says they are quite safe now.

But wont that weaken them, and so make them more liable to become diseased ?

Naw, naw, it wawnt, Sir George, he says they are quite safe now. Aw ! he's a clever man.

Next week his cattle all died.

Really, this is uncommonly like the Vaccination trick.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, in the *Contemporary Review*, sarcastically alludes to "the small-pox epidemic, which, a while ago, so unaccountably spread after twenty years of compulsory Vaccination."

The doctors call it proved that small-pox is never taken spontaneously. But a negative is incapable of proof, except in the Irishman's way.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

Patrick Sullivan, says the Magistrate, I can bring two witnesses who saw you commit the assault.

Faith your honour, if that's all, I can bring twenty who did not see me commit it.

Mr. Wolfe mentions a case of small-pox breaking out in a regiment in India, miles from any possible source of contagion.

He also says, there can be little doubt that when the minds of Physicians are directed to the possible occurrence of small-pox otherwise than by infection, there will be no difficulty in tracing it, like the other zymotic diseases, to the action of decaying organic matter.

Again, he says, "the same poisonous air will sometimes give one zymotic disease to one member of a family, and another to another, according to the constitution.

He gives instances of this.

On the 14th of May last, the bark, Athena, arrived at New York, many of the crew and passengers having died; some of small-pox, some of scarlet-fever, but most of measles. The diseases were traced to the filthy habits of some Polish Jews on board. Nothing would induce them to be clean. Soap was given them, but they eat it.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

Mr. Wolfe says, the name of the disease depends on the tissue, or organ, primarily affected. He also says, "mortality remains much the same, but one year it will take the form of typhus, another of scarlatina, another of cholera, another of small-pox; correlation in results suggesting correlation in causes."

Miss Nightingale says, "I was brought up by scientific men and ignorant women, to believe that

Miss Nightingale.

“small-pox was a thing of which there was once a specimen in the world, which went on propagating itself like dogs or cats; and that it would never begin itself. Since then, I have seen small-pox growing up in first specimen, where it could not, by any possibility, have been caught.” Nay, “more, I have seen diseases begin, grow up, and pass into one another.”

Bad air, and want of cleanliness, are always killing off those members of the community, who have not strength of constitution to resist them. As we see above different years, zymotic disease takes different forms. Of these, it is said by some doctors, that small-pox gives most chance of recovery, because its being principally in the skin saves the more vital organs. Some women say, “better death than disfigurement, but how about the much greater disfigurement from life-long skin affections, caused by Vaccination? Of course, the doctors will laugh this assertion to scorn; but that never makes the slightest difference in the truth of a thing.

As far as I can make out, amongst the thousand-and-one contradictory opinions of medical men on the subject, the same impure conditions will give one person small-pox, or some eruptive form of zymotic or filth disease, whilst another has typhus of some kind; those with healthier constitutions, or more active circulation of blood, being more likely to have it in some eruptive form. Thus, I suppose, amongst savages, small-pox is the more usual form, whilst typhus will be more common amongst the poor and ill-fed part of the population in European towns.

But, of course, I know nothing about the matter. I am not a doctor. All I can do is to compare innumerable contradictory statements and opinions of doctors, and form my own conclusions from them as best I can.

The *Times*, in the October of the cattle plague year, writing about infection says, "the theory of infection from abroad is a very old one, but is now nearly exploded. What is said of rinderpest, was said of Egyptian plague, which was invariably ascribed in those days to a ship-load of infected substances. Improved sanitary habits prevailed and the plagues ceased."

So of the black death. Small-pox at its worst has Black death. been nothing to the black death of the middle ages. Mr. Lecky tell us, that the black death swept away twenty-five millions, or a fourth part of the inhabitants of Europe. Yet improved habits have banished it, as well as plague, jail fevers, and camp fevers.

Foolish people think the proof about infection easy. But proof, either one way or the other, is extremely difficult.

A whole household has fever. The common thing to say is, that one caught it from the other. The real probability is, that the same filthy air produced the same result in all. But to prove one or the other is almost impossible.

After a doctor's visit a patient is attacked by some fever. The common thing to say is, that the doctor brought it from one of his patients.

Nothing is said of the ninety-and-nine persons he visited without imparting any fever. But any

conclusion is worthless, till both these facts are considered, then the number of cases of fever in the whole community, and finally a mathematical problem worked out in the doctrine of chances. Do this, and an approximation to a scientific fact may be arrived at. But still, there will be numerous other probabilities, which seem never to enter into the heart of doctor to contemplate.

Power of
mind and
body.

Doctors believe in the power of the body over mind, with all their hearts and with all their souls. But how about the far greater power of the mind over the body?

A great surgeon says, he has known a strong man's bodily health completely break down, by having a large fortune left him. It gave him every thing he could wish for, and so all mental interest in life ceased. In the end there was nothing for it but to hang himself, which he did.

This accords with Dr. Garth Wilkinson's assertion, that want of the christian graces and virtues is the top root of bodily disease. He means, that where these reign in their fulness, pure unselfish interest and joy in all the things of this wonderful and beautiful world keeps the organs in such healthy action that disease has no chance.

Brodie. The opposite view is that of the doctors, and well represented by Brodie, who says, that ill temper means lithic acid in the blood, and unusual benevolence is a pretty sure indication of incipient insanity, arising from disease of the brain.

Cabanis says, that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile.

There is no hope for any medical man who does not fully appreciate both sides.

I know it is hard for a man, who, according to the present ideas of the profession, thinks it his duty to devote his attention solely to the body, to escape material mindedness.* “Ten doctors, nine atheists”

* The cleverest book I ever read on these matters is “Physiology of the mind,” by Dr. Maudesley. It is admirable from the doctor’s point of view. But his philosophy about man, leaves *the man* out entirely. His system can reach nothing but the vegetable part of him. He absolutely condemns what he calls the metaphysical system of philosophy—that is, a man judging human nature by examining his own; and he tries to show, that the only true way is to examine the bodily organs and anatomize the nerves. Now, of course, this is exceedingly valuable. But what in the world can the ganglionic centres of the nerves, the posterior and anterior cerebral lobes, or even the grey matter of the spinal cord, tell one about the man himself—his loves, his hates, passions, hopes, avarice, reverence, sense of beauty, worship, vanity, pride, gratitude, &c., &c., &c.? *A man* means these things. Take them away and he is no better than a cabbage—an intellectual cabbage perhaps, but still a cabbage. But the only way a man can possibly know anything about any one of these things, is, by looking into his own soul, and even then, he will not understand the meaning of the words gratitude, holiness, worship, &c., if he has none. And yet, this way, Dr. Maudesley laughs to scorn.

The music is the real thing, not the pianoforte. Of course, to a mender of musical instruments, knowledge of all the parts is necessary, but in themselves they are nothing. So to a doctor, knowledge of the human machinery is necessary. The pianoforte mender says, “these symphonies of Beethoven are nothing. Look at the instrument that plays them; common mahogany, cat-gut, and brass wire; nothing else in the world.” In the same way, the third-rate man of science says, “all your talk about the divinity of the human soul is

says the proverb. I only say, that as long as they are one-sided, either way, so long they need not hope for truth.

Voltaire. The materially-minded Voltaire said, that Pascal's views of the wretched depravity of human nature came from his miserably bad health. On the other hand, how much of that bad health may not have come from his acted out belief that it is wicked to care for anything or anybody in this world, and from the stagnation of blood such a wretched creed must cause.

Of course, nothing could be more cruel than in all cases to attribute bad health to the want of Christian graces. Perhaps there are few more beautiful things in the world than that sometimes witnessed of a life made up of these graces, in defiance of the depressing effects of natural bodily infirmities. Still, even such a character almost must be wanting in that crowning fruit of the Spirit, "unceasing joy." Such a person can hardly "rejoice always."

I say, there is no hope for correct views about infection, or anything else connected with medicine, till the marvellous and miraculous effects produced upon body by mind and imagination, as it is sometimes called, is fully appreciated.

Instances of effects of minds on body. Fear alone has killed numbers of people. Horror of a disease will give it.

simply nonsense, I have examined the instrument that produces it, and it is nothing in the world but transmogrified protoplasm; or, nothing but lactic acid, evolved by chemical action from the cerebral lobes and the medulla oblongata."

A man has small-pox, and is marked with it. A strong healthy young farmer, a year afterwards, who had not heard of it, suddenly sees him and his altered appearance ; this has such an effect on him, that he himself dies of small-pox in a week.

A healthy strong man suddenly hears he is ruined. He is seized with gout, from which he never recovers.

Rogers, the poet, sits near a window he thinks open, though it really is shut. He is laid up with a bad cold in consequence.

Mr. Babbage, inventor of the calculating machine says, he always catches cold if he sleeps without his night-cap, which he ties under his chin, but if, by chance, he has left his night-cap at home, he ties a bit of string under his chin and that does as well.

A hysterical person, with a strong digestion, imagines he cannot digest something, and the result is, he cannot digest it.

A prize-fighter thinks he is going to hit an object. He misses it, but the imagination that he would hit it, breaks his arm.

Terror from night-mare has been known to leave permanent marks on the body.

There is strong evidence of religious diseased lunatics having actually had open wounds, as if made by thorns, on their heads, and wounds of nails on the hands and feet. Of course, this would be incredible by itself, but is perhaps not quite so when compared with other marvellous effects of mind on body.

Dr. Bird mentions an Italian poet who always fainted at the sight of mutton.

There are many instances of the sight of a cat always producing sickness ; and of others who fainted at the sight of honey.

Dr. Maudesley says, "if a man, whilst fighting, gets the idea that he will be beaten, the muscular energy is immediately weakened by that idea."

The mere idea of a nauseous taste will sometimes cause actual sickness.

Again, he says, "the mere belief in a remedy, that has no effect whatever, will sometimes cure some structural defect."

He mentions a case of an infant who was born raving mad. It required four women to hold it immediately after it was born, and it climbed on to all the tables and chairs, and tore to pieces everything it could lay its hands on. Now what a marvellous effect this is of the mind upon what is usually inert matter. The child died in teething. The way people sometimes talk of a happy release, is generally sufficiently presumptuous. Still one can hardly imagine that this little child could have been much of a "comfort to its mother."

All these effects of mind on the bodily tissues are astonishing, but no doubt true.

Spirit Rap-
ping.

Again, at a "seance." The imagination has sometimes such an effect on the bodily senses, that a person really thinks he sees chairs tumbling down, picking themselves up again ; and tables tipping over, at an angle of 45° , without spilling water out of full tumblers, or displacing tall lamps.

Verily, we live much nearer the borders of hallucination than is dreamt of in the philosophy of

most people ; and very nearly are we to being such things as dreams are made of.

People who, from some peculiarity in their education, are deficient in precision of thought sometimes, as Sidney Smith expresses it, do not know how to manage their understanding. It is apt, as he says, to get between their legs and trip them up. In America, superstitions about spirits and spirit manifestations, as they are called, are prevalent. Even that shrewd man, Artemus Ward, was no exception. He relates, how at a "seance" one day, he was asked if there was any one in the spirit land he would wish to converse with. "I replied," he says, "if Bill Tompkins, who was onct my partner in the show bizness, is sober, I would like to have a few words with him." Upon this, the mejium sez, "is the sperret of William Tompkins present ? Immediately there was three knox on the table.

William, sez I, how goze it ?

Pretty ruff, old hoss, sez he.

Air you in the show bizness, William, sez I ?

He sed he was.

"William," sez I, "can you pay me that thirteen dollars you owe me ?" He said, no, with one of the most tremenjis knox I ever experienced. Then there was silence. "Air you gone, William," I axed ? "Rayther," he replied ; and I knowd there was no use to pursoo the subject further.

But though, he thus treats the matter, "more suo," it is plain from what he says elsewhere, that he is a believer.

The automatic and unconscious action of the human mind, or, what Mr. Dallas calls "the hidden soul," is of course utterly marvellous and incomprehensible.

Mesmerism,
hypnotism,
&c. The unexplained facts that come under the heads of somnambulism, hysteria, hypnotism, mesmerism, table rapping, &c., &c., which remain after much imposture is allowed for, cannot be denied by any but the straitest sect of scientific pharisees. But to attribute them to anything but abnormal workings of the mind, or to anything that people think they mean by the term "spirits," is, in the present state of knowledge on the subject, simply superstition.

The way men of science shirk these questions, is cowardly in the extreme, and shows that their boasted love of truth is only love of themselves, of their little reputations, and of their shallow theories and ridiculous belief that the whole universe of mind and matter is comprehended within the little circle of their own knowledge. Some of them fear for their pockets, some for their reputations, and some fear disappointment to their self-conceit. But whatever the form their fear takes, they are cowards in the matter nearly every one of them.

Perhaps few follies exceed the folly of self-conceit. Intellect proverbially is connected with pride. It is then called diabolical, but it really means weakness and imbecility, for it cuts its own throat by its pride, and ceases to be true intellect, however glittering it may appear to foolish people. Every particle of self-thought takes something from the thought left for what is not self; takes something from the capacity to do good work. A dog will never catch

a hare if he stops to scratch himself at every turn.

A man cannot put his whole soul into a thing if vanity and pride (what Goethe calls the negative manifestations of human nature) occupy his mind. If a part he takes from the whole, it is no longer the whole. What such a man does manage to do always smells of conceit.

A certain distinguished living man of science, looks upon induction and inspiration as the same thing. A man heats water and finds that it boils at 212° . He tries again and it does so again. He tries it a hundred times and it does so a hundred times; so he argues by induction, and says, "water *always* boils at 212° . He is as pleased with himself at making this generalization, as little Jack Horner was when he pulled out the plum; and he says, "what a clever man am I"—"really, it must be inspiration." Some day, he takes his kettle to the top of a hill and boils it, when he finds that his beautiful induction was all folly. So he makes another and so on.

Physical science is absolutely necessary to civilization. Conceit impedes its progress more than anything else, so in the interest of science, conceit should be exposed and discouraged in every possible manner.

It is impossible to define with accuracy what a reasonable man should believe and what he should not believe; what are credible and what are incredible miracles; though, if we go deep enough, everything is miraculous. It is the part of a reasonable man to believe in many miracles, merely, because they are vouched for by men who are known to be honest.

A cat is put into a bag, taken ten miles and turned loose. It finds its way at once home again, without making one wrong turn. This is to men an incomprehensible miracle. And yet, we believe in it, because in our utter ignorance of everything to do with life, as distinguished from dead matter, we see no sufficient reason why we should not believe the honest men who tell us about it. In the same way, a reasonable man believes many things he cannot understand; things that seem to him contrary to what he thinks his experience. On the other hand, there are some things he ought not to believe in. No miraculous power in the universe could make the three angles of a triangle greater than two right angles, or two straight lines enclose a space.

The things done by any extraordinary man must be extraordinary, or he would not be an extraordinary man.

How matter is acted on must depend on the quality and quantity of "life" that acts upon it.

A small round pebble lies on the ground. The dead things around can do nothing with it. There it lies for a hundred years. At last a pig comes, turns it over, finds it not adapted for assimilation and leaves it. But still the pig has moved the stone. Then comes a man with his higher kind of vitality and his "godlike intelligence." He picks the stone up, puts it into a gun, and shoots one of his fellow creatures with it. This, to the pig, is a miracle. A higher being still would do something with the stone that would be a miracle to the man, and which, even if explained, he perhaps would not understand.

I am conscious of rambling from my point occasionally, but it is the privilege of amateur authors to do so, and I shall certainly take advantage of the privilege.

Of all amateur authors perhaps the most celebrated one is Montaigne. He indulges in unceasing digression.

Imitative diseases often look like infection.

At schools, it has happened that when a boy has been seized with an epileptic fit, other boys have been attacked also. When this takes place the cure is to threaten them with flogging.

Imitative suicide is not uncommon in jails. It is cured in a similar manner.

A sentinel, in Napoleon's army, hung himself in his sentry box. Several soldiers afterwards hung themselves in the same sentry box ; so Napoleon at length ordered it to be broken up and burned.

A few years ago, an extraordinary imitative epidemic broke out at Morzine, in Switzerland, chiefly amongst young girls. They went quite mad ; ran up trees, like monkeys, in a manner they were quite unable to do when in their right minds, and seemed, in all they did, to be possessed by evil spirits. The mania was at last stopped by the government sending soldiers and threatening them with imprisonment. In this way, this apparently infectious complaint was cured.

Similar cases are reported to be not uncommon in Tartar villages, also, amongst young girls.

Perhaps the same explanation will do for these cases, as for the imitations of monkeys. A monkey

is an observing animal, an active-minded animal, and an animal without any will or character. It sees a thing done, because it has observation ; it must do something, because it has an active organization, and so it imitates because it has no will to make it do anything else instead.

The above phenomena took place among young girls, that is, before their wills and characters were developed.

Dr. Dickson. Dr. Dickson says, that the doctrine of infection favours the pecuniary interests of the medical profession.

If so, the unconscious bias produced by pecuniary interest, to which I have already alluded once or twice, might account for the exaggerated, if not absolutely false, ideas that prevail on the subject. I suppose Dr. Dickson means, that if infection by germs in the air, floating on the tops of mountains, as well as in filthy hovels, were the sole causes of disease, sanitary precautions would be neglected as needless, pestilences would rage, and doctors would profit by them. Certainly, one prop to Vaccination is, the belief that small-pox is only taken by infection.

But the exaggerated superstitions that prevail about infection lead also to other things, such as medical state-paid inspectorships, which must tend, as human nature is constituted, to bias the minds of medical men in favour of such superstitions.

Dr. Dickson states, that in the matter of cholera, the official medical authorities have already contradicted themselves twice about its infectiousness.

First, they said it was infectious, then that it was not, and now again that it is. The interval of time between each contradiction was about the same. I believe another is nearly due.

The only really scientific experiment I ever heard of, which resulted in showing the truth of infection, was that of a German doctor, who gave small-pox to a sheep by keeping its head wrapped up for a long time in the shirt of a man who had died of that complaint. This may, perhaps, be true; and, if so, it tends to show that people should not keep their heads wrapped up for too long a time together in dirty shirts. But it is not much to the point, for, in the first place, a man is not a sheep; and, in the second place, I have been talking about infection under ordinary, not extraordinary circumstances.

The newest and neatest thing in the doctrine of infection, is the assertion doctors are now making, that consumption is infectious. They also profess to have imparted the disease from men to guinea-pigs by inoculation. Now, what an opening there is here for some enterprising man. Inoculate everybody in infancy from these guinea-pigs, as is done in the case of small-pox from cows; then we shall all be free from consumption to the end of time, and a grateful legislature will reward the man who starts the practise with a grant of £30,000. It will be a far greater boon than Vaccination, inasmuch as consumption is a far more fatal disease than small-pox. Repeat an analogous operation for every complaint to which man is subject, and the millennium itself will have arrived. The allopath

will lie down with the homœopath, and doctors will reign upon the earth for a thousand years. I cannot bear to ridicule a profession composed, for the most part, of such excellent well-meaning men, but when one sees them keeping up old world superstitions, and spreading misery that makes a man's heart ache to think of, what can one do? I know there is beginning to be a promise of better things, but that does not alter what has gone on up to the present time, and what is so largely going on now.

Of course, I am no more qualified than anyone else is, in the absence of all proof one way or the other, to decide how much exaggeration there is in the vulgar ideas about infection; but, considering that all the stories I ever heard, that are supposed to prove it, can be accounted for in other ways—considering that all our ideas on the subject come from the doctors, who, as Dr. Dickson says, have a pecuniary interest in keeping up belief in it; and, considering that all they offer as proofs would, in any other science, be laughed at as ridiculously inadequate, I say, considering these things, it is the part of a wise man to withhold his belief one way or the other, at any rate, till something resembling scientific proof be offered to him.

Epidemics are caused, probably, by some inscrutable atmospheric influence. But sometimes it is not quite inscrutable. A few years ago, at St. Petersburg, there was an unprecedentedly sudden change in the weather. Two days afterwards, 30,000 of the inhabitants were laid up with influenza. I have no doubt that the Russian doctors

said, that every one of these 30,000 caught it from one of the others, or that it was communicated one to another by some invisible insect.

At this moment nearly all the horses in the Eastern States of America have got bad colds, in consequence, no doubt, partly of peculiarities in the weather, partly of bad stable management. But the American horse doctors, tell the free and enlightened public that it is a mysterious epizootic, only taken by contagion, and the free and enlightened public appear to swallow down what is told them, with every bit as much gaping simplicity as if they were mere down-trodden inhabitants of the effete old countries.

Foolish people are surprised, when one animal has an illness, to see others in the same locality have it also, and they can only account for it by saying, that one caught it from another. People who are not foolish would be surprised if it were otherwise. When one salmon in a river is hungry and takes the bait well, the others are hungry also. When one salmon is not hungry the others are not hungry. The same influence that affects one naturally affects the others. Perhaps, however, they will say, that one salmon does catch hunger from another. It really would not surprise me. It seems to please most people, so much more, to account for diseases by infection, than by dirt, bad air, and bad ventilation, that I feel some compunction about saying anything that may possibly, in some degree, tend to diminish this satisfaction.

CHAPTER VI.

THE GERM THEORY OF DISEASE.

“The germ theory is an assumption of causes of the existence of which we have no evidence to account, for effects they do not explain.”—
BECKINGHAM.

The present ideas about infection, are connected with the germ theory, according to which every disease is caused by its own separate invisible fungus or animalcule.

According to this theory, catching scarlet fever, means unwittingly swallowing a germ or egg of that particular small creature which causes the complaint.

The creature itself is so minute as to be invisible and undiscoverable even with the aid of the most perfect instruments ; so its egg or germ must be very small indeed.

I learn that these germs may be encountered everywhere, even to the tops of the highest mountains.

How germs
kill people.

A person dies of typhus fever at St. Petersburg. A germ of the typhus fever animalcule emanates from him. A strong east wind blows it across Europe to the top of Snowdon. Mr. Smith, touring in Wales, goes up Snowdon, and arrives at the top exactly at the same moment as the germ from Russia.

He unwittingly swallows this germ and immediately catches typhus fever by infection from the man who died at St. Petersburg.

To account for the existence of the minute malignant being on this earth at all, we were told by the highest authorities last August, at the meeting of the Royal Scientific Association, that its lineal ancestor was most probably brought to our planet on an aerolite. I believe, this is called, by scientific men, a complete and satisfactory explanation of the origin of organic life ; but if they do think anything more about the matter, it pleases them more to believe that life originates in some other planet than that it has commenced on this one. For some, perhaps, similar reason, it seems to please doctors more to think that diseases originated a long time ago, than that they arose spontaneously in later times. Of course, every disease must have commenced some time or other, but the longer time ago that period can be put back, the more pleased they are.

I suppose, the idea, that disease is caused by living animalculæ, has something to do with the fact that dead animals are often observed to be full of maggots, or the germs of insects, more or less minute. But how about putting the cart before the horse ? An Irishman sees a dead magpie. "Look, he says, at that poor magpoi and the magg'ts, shure and they've kilt it inthirely."

There are few things that cause me so much amusement as Irish bulls, or other things of a similar kind, that show perhaps activity, but at the same confusion of intelligence.

Irish bulls
and puzzle-
headed-ness

Illustrations
of these.

“Ye call that man thin” says Pat, “faith, but I know a man thats as thin as two av him.”

One man’s as good as another says one of the “people’s friends.” “That he is” says the Irishman “and a great deal better.”

An Irishman accosts by mistake a supposed friend. “By the powers its naither of us” he says, discovering his error.

That stove saves half the fuel, says the ironmonger.

Faix, thin I’ll take two of them and save it all.

A brilliant Hibernian builds a shed over his sun dial to protect it from the weather.

Fathers, says the Irish preacher, “ye have child’n or if ye have none, your sons or your daughters may have.”

Paddy shoots a pheasant, which comes with a whack to the ground. “Shure, but I’ve wasted the powder and shot—the fall alone would have killed it.”

Sawing a branch off a tree, Paddy props the ladder against the branch. He saws away between the ladder and the tree, tumbles down and breaks his neck.

An Irish footman is sent to fill a hot-water tin for the feet with water. He cannot find any hot water, so he fills it with cold.

An emetic is given to Paddy. “Did you take it” says the doctor, “Shure and I did, but it was no use, it would’nt stay on my stomach atall, atall.”

Twelve men set out on a journey, and cross a river. They count to see if they have all got over safe ; but each one forgetting to count himself, only make up

the number to eleven. They conclude that one of them has been drowned whilst crossing, so they all give up their journey and return home again.

An Irish preacher, holding forth on the goodness of a merciful Providence, quotes as an instance of it, the fact that rivers are always sent to flow near large towns.

I merely give these few cases to illustrate the puzzleheadedness which always seems to me so amusing.

Here is another one, illustrating more closely the matter in question, of putting the cart before the horse, in cases of parasitic phenomena attending death.

A tree is dying, and in consequence, a great fungus appears near the root. The sagacious owner of the tree, thinking the fungus the cause of its dying, cuts it off and expects the tree to recover forthwith.

We all know that insect life follows death, but that it causes it there is no evidence whatever.

Perhaps one way of accounting for the eagerness of medical men to establish the germ theory, is, that unconscious bias which is produced by pecuniary interest.* It may decidedly be considered to be

Why Doctors
support the
germ theory

* "Unconscious bias produced by pecuniary interest." It will be said, that I repeat this phrase tediously; but it is better to bore by repetition, than confuse by ambiguity; and it is the key note that explains very much, that otherwise would be inexplicable. In commenting on an alleged lunacy case, where doctors had been employed to give some astounding evidence, the *Saturday Review* says, that though they were probably honest men who believed what they said, if a commission *de lunatico* were held on the doctors themselves, it would end in their all being sent to be locked up in asylums.

indirectly one of the props to Vaccination. For if small-pox can be taken by swallowing the germ of an invisible animalcule, even on the tops of mountains, sanitary measures become a farce, and there will be nothing for it, but for the public to resort to some doctor's nostrum that brings them large profits, such as inoculation or Vaccination, with three punctures on each arm, at a guinea a puncture, and in addition to that, re-vaccination every few years, with three punctures on each arm, at a guinea a puncture again.

It appeared, in the evidence before the committee, that the charge for Vaccination amongst the richer classes was one guinea for each individual; but that was the old Vaccination with only one puncture. The new operation, invented in consequence of the failure of the old one, being longer, the fees, I suppose, will be longer too.

Diabolical
Animalculæ.

Formerly, people accounted for diseases and misfortunes, the causes of which they could not understand, by attributing them to witches and evil spirits. At the present time, diseases are believed to be caused by imaginary, invisible, malignant, and diabolical little animalculæ; but this is only a difference in the form of superstition.

A cause, or a place, being unknown, always sets the imagination of men to work.

Yellow-hair-
ed demons.

Eusebius tells us, that beyond Britannia, there were many islands filled with demons and evil spirits, who occasioned every kind of injury and disease to the inhabitants; and he even describes their personal appearance and habits, as having long yellow hair, wearing small silver shoes, and using bows made of

the ribs of dead men, with which they shoot those who have offended them.

I have certainly not yet found in medical works, any similar description of the appearance and habits of the scarlet fever or cholera animalcule, but I doubt not I should do so if I searched carefully.

Now, I must not be supposed to deny the existence of these little creatures. Nothing could be more unphilosophical; quite as much so, as to deny that the moon is made of green cheese, a thing no cautious thinker would dream of doing. All he would consider himself justified in doing, would be to withhold his belief in that being the case, until such time as some trustworthy evidence of the fact were offered to him.

Beckingham says, "the germ theory is an assumption of causes, of the existence of which we have no evidence, to account for effects which they do not explain."

Theories are usually founded on analogies. We have heard a good deal lately about the scientific use of the imagination. Theories founded on analogies.

The most celebrated instance of this exercise of the imagination, working upon analogies, is that of Sir Isaac Newton.
Sir Isaac Newton.

Sitting under an apple tree at night, looking at the moon, and wondering why it stayed so close to the earth, instead of going off into infinite space, all at once an apple fell on his upturned countenance, and caused him considerable pain. Whilst rubbing the place the idea suddenly struck him, that the same force which caused the apple to fall, might also cause

the moon to keep near the earth. Everybody knows that this guess, founded on analogy, turned out to be true.

But what analogy is there to justify the germ theory; according to which every complaint, such as cholera or scarlatina, is caused by a minute living fungus? The only instance I know of any serious disease being imparted by living creatures is that of hydrophobia. Now every case of this terrible complaint is undoubtedly caused by a mad dog. But to make the analogy worth anything, the doctors ought to say, that scarlatina is caused by a mad fungus; for it is the madness in the dog that causes the hydrophobia. Now I have never seen this even hinted at.

It may be said, what signifies theory? Practice is the real thing. But practice often depends upon theory. The theory formerly prevailed, that every disease is caused by some morbid matter in the system, which must be removed by bleeding. This, for instance, was the doctrine in the case of influenza. But at last it was found, that in this complaint, those who were bled died, and in extreme astonishment the lancet was laid aside, after having caused fearful destruction—that is, laid aside in some countries. In Italy it still reigns. I understand, that in Campana, all domestic animals are bled every Easter Monday.

When doctors differ, the public must judge for itself as best it can. If one eminent astronomer were to say, the moon is twenty miles off, whilst another says, a million, I must form my own opinion

Mad Dog.

What to do
when Doc-
tors differ.

to the best of my power. When one doctor says, that the primary cause of disease is poison to the blood, and another says, that the cause is injury to some tissue or organ, which in turn causes injury to the quality of the blood, I must form my own opinion as best I can ; and, in fact, I have formed it. My opinion is, that the theory of disease being primarily caused by poisoning of the blood, and its fermenting in consequence like malt,* is superstitious nonsense, most likely originated by some doctor with great imagination, who had mistaken his vocation, and betaken himself to science instead of writing sensation novels.

* The word “zymotic” is derived from the Greek word ζύμωσις—Fermentation.

CHAPTER VII.

THE "POSITIVE—ENTITY SUPERSTITION."

"Disease is not a specific morbid entity, that like some evil spirit takes possession of the body, but a condition of degeneration from healthy life."—DR. H. MAUDESLEY.

Connected with the germ theory is the strange notion, that every disease is a positive entity.

Dr. Chambers, in the "Renewal of life," says, "disease is not a positive something, but a negation of something. A disease means certain symptoms caused by a negation or deficiency of vitality ; that is, by partial death."

Mr. Wolfe. Mr. Wolfe says, that the name of the disease depends upon the locality primarily affected. He also says, "perhaps minute animalculæ may be present, in different stages of decay of tissue, and are assumed to be the cause instead of the consequence."

M. Littré M. Littré says, that disease has no independent existence, but only means disordered machinery.

Dr. Maudesley. Dr. H. Maudesley says, "disease is not a specific morbid entity, that like some evil spirit has taken mischievous possession of the body, but it is a condition of degeneration from healthy life."

These opinions represent the most advanced thought of the day.

It is very cheering to find, that at last, we have Socrates. advanced as far as Socrates, who defined disease to be a disarrangement of the body. And yet, ever since his time, doctors have spent all their artillery upon this imaginary monster "disease"—this bubble with nothing in it. They are like the Chinese in our war with them. When our fire-arms were mowing them down by hundreds, they could think of nothing but our big drum, which they thought must be some tremendous implement of destruction and therefore directed all their engines of war towards it. At length, when the war was over, they discovered it was nothing but a big hollow thing, with nothing in it.

The Chinese
and our
big drum.

Voltaire, laughing at the delusion of a similar kind Voltaire. to that of diseases being entities, says, "*pauvre pédant, tu vois une plante qui végète et tu dis "vegetation;" mais de grace q'entend tu par ce mot? Y'a-t-il un être reel qui s'appelle vegetation? Si une tulipe pouvait parler et qu'elle te dit "ma vegetation et moi nous sommes deux êtres joints ensemble ne te moquerais—tu de la tulipe?"*"

Dirt gets into a vital part of a steam engine. The Sick steam engine. The healthy motion of that part is arrested. Heat or inflammation takes the place of the motion. The whole machinery works in a defective manner. The breathing becomes hard and laboured, the intervals between the gasps becomes longer and longer, till at length the creature altogether ceases to puff. But we don't go and tell everybody that the engine has caught that terrible disease piston-pox, and that they must therefore be sure and keep all other engines

out of the way of the diabolical little piston-pox animalcule. No, we repair the damage by removing all impurity, and we take care to keep the thing clean for the future.

Disease is not a thing, but only a defective condition of a thing. Enteritis is not an actual something; it is only an inflamed condition of a something, that is to say, of the duodenum, whatever the duodenum may be, for I have not a notion.

No hard line
between
different
diseases.

But it is supposed that medicine has to fight, not only this imaginary monster "disease," but an innumerable number of these monsters, which are always roaming about, seeking whom they may destroy, when, in fact, no hard line can be drawn between one so called disease and another.

Classifications are necessary in order to keep knowledge together and to assist memory, only, people should remember, that though necessary, they are not true. God does not classify. He does not put things, that are the same, into classes, for he never makes two things the same. He never imitates himself. No two cases of illness are ever alike. No two pebbles on the beach are exactly alike. No two grains of sand are alike.

Some doctors, I am afraid, not of the most profound order, seem to expect not only to classify every case of disease under one of the heads they have invented, but to be very much shocked and put out if any one of them turns out to be not cut in exactly the correct pattern.

Of course, I know that this blind belief in the separability of classes of disease comes from the

natural deficiency in the average human intelligence, which deficiency they share with animals who can see isolated objects with their senses, but have not intelligence to compare them or recognize connections or unity of root and principle where such exist.

Bacon says, the power of seeing distinctions is common, whilst the power of seeing resemblances is rare.

Bain says, that the power of comparing and seeing resemblances is the essence of genius, but that the mass of mankind are as good as destitute of it. Power of seeing resemblances rare

Dr. Maudesley says about classifications and systems, "rules and systems are necessary for ordinarily endowed mortals, whose business it is to gather together and arrange materials."—In another place, he calls these ordinary mortals—"sense-machines for registering observations." Dr. Maudesley.

The "sense-machines" can compare sometimes, but only outside resemblances which are evident to the senses ; thus, they can compare just enough to classify.

Every science wants its industrious "sense-machines," as well as its men of genius.

In astronomy, for instance, the "sense-machine" records everything his eyes can tell him about the moon—how it is yellow—how it is round—how it is out of reach of his hand—how it is like Cheshire cheese—how it most likely is one—how at any rate it must be put into the same class—how it goes round the earth—how long it takes to get round, &c. &c. He does the same with the stars and the sun.

- Then comes the man of genius, who puts two and two together, and finds out all about it.*

The Cattle
Doctors.

The cattle doctors, during the cattle plague, were quite unable to see the analogy that existed between

* The mistake the men of genius are apt to make is, that they are the salt of the earth. I am afraid this is rarely the case, however useful to mankind their intellects may be. Professor Bain says, that human nature seems so limited, that when great preponderance of intellect exists, there will generally be observed a deficiency in moral and religious qualities. Even Socrates has been accused of a tendency to hard utilitarianism and a want of human affections. The deficiencies of Voltaire, Rousseau, and Bacon are proverbial. Goethe is often called a heathen and a selfish egotist. Descartes has been described as a man without feeling. The French proverb says, "bon poète mauvais homme;" and even of Newton, Bain says, that beyond violence of temper, his moral qualities were negative. A German saying says, "all great men are monsters." "Great wit to madness nearly is allied;" and there is a terrible connection between madness and badness. Charles Reed says, that three parts of the genius of England is shut up in madhouses.

Many a despised mere fact collector and "sense-machine" is really infinitely superior to many a vast genius; for he will be a man, and not a mere intellect.

Perhaps about the most remarkable feature in Christianity was, putting for the first time in the history of the world moral and religious before intellectual excellence. "Whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away." "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." "If any man seemeth to be wise, let him become a fool that he may be wise." "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Still, though we call ourselves Christians, we do not get over the old way of relatively overvaluing intellect. Not that it can be overvalued absolutely, so long as it knows its proper place as man's slave; to make his rail-roads, pots, pans, books, science, pins, needles, pictures, metaphysics, theologies, calico, and public speeches. Of course, a slave cannot be too strong.

rinderpest and the zymotic diseases in man. They said, "when you cut a cow open, you find an inflamed membrane here and another there, a disorganized appearance about the second stomach, an unusual look about the third, and something or other else about the fourth, all which is totally different from typhus complaints in men." Of course it is. How can a man be disorganized in his third stomach when he has'nt got one? Still, the rinderpest was a similar disease, being a zymotic fever, produced by filth and wrong living, and curable by purity of air, good management, and cleanliness.

Curative effects of pure cold air.

During the cattle plague, a farmer near Malton employed a man to kill and bury two beasts that had been given up by the doctors as hopeless cases. But the work was hard, and the day was wet, so when half the task was done, he went into a public house to refresh himself. By a most happy chance he got extremely drunk, and continued so for twenty-four hours; then, when he returned to his work he found the remaining beast quietly grazing by the grave of its companion, and in a day or two it was quite well. The fact is, the two animals had been all but killed in the orthodox manner, by heat, filth, darkness, and doctoring, and the cold pure air of frosty December weather acted like a charm.

Illustrative Anecdote.

I remember several similar stories.

This kind of treatment, or rather no-treatment, would have cured nine-tenths of them;* but we

* I lately read some excellent observations in "*The Times*" about "foot and mouth" disease, showing the strong probability there is

knocked them on the head instead, and now complain that beef is dear.

What strange creatures men are. In childhood they spill their milk, and then whine because they have none to drink. Later in life, they run their sewage into the ocean, and then whine because they have no manure—send their rainfall into the gutters, and then whine because they have no water—keep their cattle in unnatural unhealthy conditions, and then whine because they become subject to disease—kill and bury them six feet deep, and then whine because they have no stock for their fields—get higher pay for their labour, and then whine because the price of what is produced by that labour becomes higher—insist on, and get equality, and then whine when they have thus lost liberty—insist on, and get liberty, and then whine when they have thus lost equality—quarrel with, and prevent the formation of

that fatality in that complaint, when it occurs, always arises from “doctoring.” Then follows an anecdote about cholera in Ireland.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

A man had cholera.

The doctor gave the patient's brother some medicine for him.

A day or two afterwards meeting him in the street, the doctor said,

“Well John, how is your brother Pat?”

Long life to your honour he's foinely.

“I'm very glad to hear it, John; it's an ugly complaint that cholera.”

Throth, and your honour it is, and poor Pat had a bad time of it, but praised be the Lord he's well again; and plase your honour the dog's dead.

“What Dog?”

Oh, your honour, but he struggled hard.

“But what dog are you talking of my good fellow?”

Plase your honour I gave the medicine to the dog; but Pat's doing foinely your honour.

capital, and then whine because wages are less than they think they should be*—treat the less rich in worldly wealth as if they were scarcely human beings, and then whine when a revolution casts them from their high estate—legislate for men as if they were children and then whine because they behave like children—pay tramps for begging, and then whine because tramps beg—and so I might go on for pages. Of course, it may be said, that they have a right to do most of these things if it pleases them, but to do them, and then whine over the consequences that necessarily result from doing them, seems, to thinking people, so very strange and unintelligent, that in order to account for it, they sometimes feel themselves obliged to resort to theories like those of Mr. Darwin, however repugnant they may be.

To return to sense-machines. It is only amongst the higher races of men that the power of doing more than seeing and knowing mere isolated facts seems to exist at all. The Chinese know facts. But they The Chinese. can do nothing with them. They knew the mere fact about gunpowder a thousand years before the Europeans did. But they knew nothing more till we showed them its enormous value by shooting them with it.

* This matter is so simple, that it seems hardly to need explaining. The more capital and capitalists there are in the world, the greater the demand must be for labour, and the higher the wages. If there were no such thing as capital, there could be no such thing as wages. To find this state of things absolutely we should have to go to the lower animals, but an approximation to it we no doubt find amongst some of the more degraded races of savages.

But, even in Europe, "relation" is in a great degree a new development, perhaps due partly to Hegel. Hegel, who taught that no fact is isolated or limited, that all things in the universe mutually touch and are linked together; and that everything is relative having its meaning elsewhere than in itself.

Dr. D. Tuke talks of the folly of those who mistake the classifications men make, for convenience, for truth.

Miss Nightin-
gale.

Miss Nightingale talks of the practical unity of epidemics, and that exemption from them is not to be sought by any one thing like Vaccination, but by removal of the causes.

An eminent physician once said to me, that all the zymotic diseases, from nettle rash to Oriental plague, are probably only varieties of one thing, dove-tailing into each other, with infinite complexities, like colours.

We describe every horse as being one of half-a-dozen colours, and yet, no two horses are the same colour exactly. No line can be drawn between bay and brown, or between bay and chesnut, and I have now and then seen a horse, about whose colour no two persons could agree, and which had to be described in the racing entries as either brown, or chesnut, or grey, or black. In fact, there is no line between colours. Still, for convenience, we classify them in a coarse broad way that answers for practical purposes.

Classifications though necessary to men are absolutely false. Recognising this truth depends upon seeing the relation between things, depends, that

is, upon the comparing faculty. It is a bad look-out therefore for the general reception of truth in this matter, if Bacon and Professor Bain are right in saying, that the comparing faculty is confined to a few exceptional people of an unusual degree of intelligence. But I confess that I am Utopian enough to believe there may be something in the common idea that in some countries a little progress as it is called, may be taking place. If this is so, perhaps the power to compare and to see relation and unity of principle where such exists may become more general than it is.

I will give one more instance of classification in addition to those of diseases and colours; that, namely, of the faculties of the human mind. Philosophers make out long lists of these faculties, which answer well enough for practical purposes. But it is all false actually. There is no more reason to say there are twenty faculties than to say there are a thousand. No line can be drawn between any one faculty and its next door neighbour, nor can any one faculty by any possibility be accurately defined. Take "love," for instance. What an utter farce the attempt Love. must be to define it. Brown is an excellent young man of twenty-one. He is passionate and ardent, but impassible and inconstant. He is in love with Clara who has blue eyes. But how can his love be defined? It is one thing one moment, the next it is something totally different, and the next different again. It is one thing when Clara presses his hand, another thing when she talks to Jones, and something totally different from either, when she dances

with Robinson. A few months afterwards, Brown is in love with Laura, who has black eyes. All these same circumstances occur again, but Brown's feelings under them have assumed altogether different shades. They are different again in the case of Mary, of Jane, Elizabeth, Dorothy, and the rest. His combinations and permutation of feeling are absolutely infinite in complexity and variety, and and yet they all come under the one head "love." By this one word all is expressed although every faculty Brown possesses with every organ, blood-vessel, and nerve in his whole body participates in it. His whole being is in love, not a mere fractional part of him. So it is with every other so-called faculty. A man is *one*; generally lob-sided more or less, but still no less *one*.

Strictly speaking, except in the merest mathematical and arithmetical matters, nothing can be accurately defined. Who, for instance, can define the flavour of a strawberry, the feeling of gratitude, or the meaning of the word "Divine?" All that a man can say of the latter word is that it means every thing that is excellent, holy, and exalted. But to some poor creatures these terms are without meaning; and of others, the meaning is different to each one, for no two people are alike.

A man may do some little in the way of defining what he means by such words as hope, joy, worship, &c., by metaphor, poetry, and music; but ordinary language is utterly impotent.

We call ourselves free from superstition in these days, but really I cannot see it, if my definition be

correct, that superstition is believing in things that really only exist in the imaginations of foolish people. The form of superstition changes, but surely only the form.

We believe in imaginary malignant entities which we call by the names of different diseases. Why is this less superstitious than the old beliefs in malignant spirits which made people ill ?

According to Zoroaster, there are two kinds of spirits. The Amschaspands, or good spirits, who bring health and happiness to man ; and the Devs, or malignant spirits, who bring disease and misery. Zoroaster.

The only difference I can see is, that in these days we only believe in the Devs, not in the Amschaspands.

Formerly, the Devil caused disease by means of witches ; now he does it by means of malignant little diabolical animalculæ.

Still, in some respects, things are better now than formerly. Still the world
perhaps
improves a
little.

A woman at Basle, as we read in the Hexenhammer, had, for nearly seven years, interviews with the Devil, till at last God, as we are told, took pity on her, and accordingly she was seized, tortured, and burned alive by a slow fire.*

*It was supposed that witchcraft was confined to women, on account of the inherent wickedness of the sex. Phenomena connected with somnambulism puzzled the learned in those days very much. By some it was supposed to be caused by witches ; but the more prevailing opinion was that it arose from the somnambulist having been baptized by a priest when in a state of intoxication.

Anecdote.

We read in the Old Chronicles, that in 1459, at Arras, very terrible things took place. The discovery was suddenly made that many of the inhabitants were in the habit of going by night to meet the Devil, who delivered to them his commands and received his homage. He allowed them to kiss him. On account of these things many people of condition were imprisoned and horribly racked and tortured, till they confessed every thing. Others were burned alive.

Now these two stories undoubtedly show that whatever superstitions we may be subject to in these days, the accompanying circumstances are less horrible, which leads one to hope that, after all, in one or two countries, improvement is taking place, however slowly. No doubt a man in England, at the present day, is treated very cruelly by the law when he refuses to have his younger children vaccinated because his elder ones have been killed by the operation ; but at any rate he is neither burned alive nor tortured in body.

I know it is the fashion to say, that in civilized countries the age of superstition is over. But is it so ?

Illustrative
Anecdote.

Not long ago, in a Yorkshire village, amongst the candidates to prepare for confirmation, an old woman presented herself. The clergyman pointed out to her that the rite was usually intended for younger people ; but she was unable to see it. She said, " What's good for yoong fawks moost be good for awld fawks, and aw dear I has the rheumatiz so bad that I says to Mrs. Brown, " Mrs. Brown,"

says I, "I'm joost gawin to try confirmaation, and Mrs. Brown says, "Betsy, says she, your right," them was her words.

Of course it may be said that this took place in a poor and ignorant class ; but is it much better amongst the educated ? I was told a table-turning story not long ago. A "seance" was being held, which came to an unfortunate termination. The unhappy table taking too sudden a turn, tumbled down and broke its leg. Now this was vouched for by a room full of educated people.

In America, belief in spirit rapping and table turning seems to be quite as general as the belief in witchcraft was formerly.

There will be no hope for medicine till the "positive—entity" superstition is conquered, and I fear it will take some time, as there is, I have no doubt, an unconscious bias in the minds of medical men in its favour, partly in consequence of its being one of the props of Vaccination.

The unintelligent inability to see that each so-called "disease" is not a separate clearly definable entity, leads to a great deal of the difference of opinion that is proverbial amongst doctors. If a case shows as many symptoms of one complaint as it does of another, it will, of course, be a toss up which it is called.

During the cattle plague, everything was called rinderpest, and every animal was slaughtered. And yet even of rinderpest there were all degrees. One case I knew of a beast surviving because it got well before the executioner arrived. It merely had a

slight cold for forty-eight hours. Most of the others in the same yard had the complaint in its worst form. Some in the yard escaped altogether.

If I give illustrations from cattle plague experience, it is only because they are equally illustrations of the disagreements that take place amongst our own doctors ; for the same superstitions produce the same confusion and helplessness of mind in both cases.

One case I knew where the inspector ordered a beast to be slaughtered. The owner expostulated, and said it was not a case of rinderpest ; but all in vain, and slaughtered it was. When too late it was discovered to have been an ordinary attack of pneumonia.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

Some boys were once sent up to Dr. Keats, the flogging head master of Eton, to be examined for confirmation ; but by some mistake he thought they had been sent up to be flogged. The boys expostulated, but the doctor was accustomed to boys expostulating under the circumstances, so flogged they were every one of them. When the ceremony was over the mistake was discovered.

During the cattle plague, a very graphic account was given me by an eye-witness of what took place in his town. How some beasts were driven thirty miles in thirteen hours ; how symptoms of disease appeared amongst them ; how the whole town was in alarm ; how the mayor, the corporation, the doctors, and the police, all came in a posse to the spot ; how all the doctors differed as to the nature of the disease ; how the inspector at last gave the word of command for

the slaughter to commence ; how, with this view, prussic acid was administered to the beasts ; how, upon their neglecting to die, the dose was doubled ; how this only seemed to refresh them and make them rather more lively and cheerful than they were before ; how knives were then had recourse to ; how this was attended with great success ; how the medical inspector then demonstrated clearly and indisputably, from the state of the intestines, the undoubted existence of rinderpest ; and *how all the doctors still differed as to the nature of the disease.*

How Doctors
differ.

Everyone who has had anything to do with illness must see that these stories well illustrate the disagreements always going on amongst our own doctors, and which must exist so long as medicine is founded on superstitions, and not upon facts—so long as people believe that God works strictly according to doctors' patterns, instead of the truth that He pays no attention to them whatever.

CHAPTER VIII.

MEDDLE AND MUDDLE.

“Quam parvâ sapientiâ mundus guhernatur.”—PROVERB.

Expediency. MY position is this : that even supposing it to be apparently expedient, it must be wrong to introduce into the veins of every born human being, filthy half-decomposed matter from a diseased brute.

The position of the government is, that right or wrong, it is expedient, and therefore must be made compulsory.

There is no doubt that expediency is at present the acknowledged war-cry of politicians—not principle,* but expediency or measures that produce good consequences. But what in the world can men know of consequences.

Illustrations. I will put a case solely from the expediency or good-for-the-country-in-a-pecuniary-sense point of view:

A miserable creature is born into the world, who perhaps possesses very great intelligence, but no principle, conscience, will, or self-control. Accord-

* Their motto seems to be the same as that of the pious editor in the Biglow Papers :

“ I dont belief in princerple,
But O I dew in interest.”

ing to the laws of nature, or to use a phrase I prefer, the laws of God, such a being soon dies from the unchecked indulgence of his desires. What does a utilitarian government do ? It argues in this wise. Here is an extremely intelligent citizen who may be of the utmost use to the country in a pecuniary point of view ; let us keep him alive by all possible means. With this intent the man is actually kept alive for a few years by compelling him to be comparatively sober, temperate, and chaste, by act of parliament—for a short time only, but still long enough for him to beget a considerable family of still more imbecile creatures than himself, one of whom lives long enough to accomplish a gigantic swindle upon the government ; another, a clever engineer, (for they are all clever,) in a drunken fit, sends a railway train to destruction ; another passes his life in jail ; whilst a fourth lives on poor rates. The men are drunkards, the women are worse. One or two more generations succeed, each one more imbecile than the last, till at length the race ends in drivelling idiocy ; * by which time this interesting family has cost the country a very tidy lot of money.

* See Dr. Maudesley on hereditary degeneration in an excellent little work entitled ‘ ‘ Body and Mind.’ ’ His account of the typical degeneration of these families is as follows :—

First generation :—Immorality. Alcoholic excess. .

Second generation :—Hereditary drunkenness. General paralysis.

Third generation :—Hypochondria. Homicidal tendencies.

Fourth generation :—Feeble intelligence. Stupidity. Mania.

Transition to complete idiocy, and probable extinction of the family.

Then is nothing to be done for poor weak-charactered creatures? Nothing by government undoubtedly. Much, very much, by real Christian influence. The author of "Ecce Homo" says, "there exists no instrument for turning a bad man into a good one, except personal influence." * The

* The way the influence of a Christian character acts upon a degraded one is by creating in the latter noble passions which destroy the ignoble ones. All the cold reasoning in the world of torpid souled logical utilitarians will not keep, or even tend to keep a man from giving way to degrading passions that tempt him. Whereas the Christian or unselfish passions set up in opposition do the thing at once. The author of "Ecce Homo," instead of "passion" uses the term "enthusiasm," but the word is a weak one. "Enthusiasm" gives me the idea of mere excitement of the imagination over a hobby. A poor professional philanthropist incapable of passions, good, bad, or indifferent, unless fuss can be called one, or self-importance—I say even this poor creature, who merely heats his brain over a hobby, will claim to be inspired by an "enthusiasm of humanity." The author of "Ecce Homo" himself, says, "that Christ's aim (in contradistinction to the philosopher's aim of subjugating the passions to reason) was the subjugation of the low passions, by placing them under the dominion, not of reason, but of the high and holy passions." He also says, "that men do not become generous and humane by logical influences—that the philosophic good man, who comes to his moral conclusions by reasoning, is usually a languid, melancholic, hard man, who does right if he does it at all without warmth—that his feelings of sympathy, feeble perhaps at first, have been made still feebler by brain work and solitude—that at times he will startle us with immoralities into which he has been led by ingenuity unchecked by healthy feelings—that no one loves such a man, whatever cold esteem people may feel for him, &c., &c."

Passion alone can drive away passion. To expect a passion to retreat before the ratiocinations and maundering moralizing of utilitarianism, however true or truistic they may be, is simply

influence of a strong Christian character over a weak one is sometimes miraculous. The weak may become strong and lastingly strong. But what influence

childish ; one might as well expect a wild bull to turn tail at the sound of a sheep's baa-baaing. Set a tiger upon the bull and he decamps then and there.

Christianity means baptizing people with fire.

Utilitarianism means baptizing them with water gruel.

Heine's definition of the divine life was "unceasing passion without unrest."

Passion may be defued to be that which sends and keeps the blood coursing through the veins in opposition to abstract thought, melancholy, depression, and death.

Dante put melancholy people into his lowest hell.

Crabbe Robinson said that he recognized the greatness of passion, though he could not reach it himself.

Les grandes pensées viennent du coeur says the French proverb.

Heine says, "the deepest thought can only come from the highest passion."

If this be true I wonder what sort of article "sweetness and light" will turn out. And as for utilitarianism, men do not gather figs from thistles, neither do they make nectar from sawdust, nor sweet wine from deal shavings.

Few experience these Christian passions to any great degree it may be said, and with some truth perhaps ; at any rate the lower passions are without doubt considerably prevalent. "Many are called but few are chosen." Still most men, who have the capacity to know one when they see him, have met with a saint once or twice in their lives. And when I say saint, I mean the real thing, not the canting counterfeit, nor the passionless nonentity. The real saints are always free from anything that can possibly be called cant, and they always take the greatest interest and most effective part in all the ordinary pursuits and occupations of every day life ; indeed none so thoroughly enjoy life as they do ; for being free from everykind of vanity there is nothing to prevent them from putting their whole souls into what interests them, and thus extracting from it delight to the full undiminished by those

can a government exercise upon a poor wretch ? Simply the influence of policeman X ; in other words absolutely none.

considerations about self which cause so much anxiety and distraction to the rest of the world ; and this freedom from vanity comes from the fact that it, with all the other selfish passions, have been driven out of their house by the Christian or unselfish passions. In comparison with these people, and with what they themselves might be, mankind in general rightly feel and call themselves miserable sinners, but except by comparison, they are as a rule, very good kind-hearted beings, whilst some of them are charming, and many are highly intelligent. Men are said to know nothing absolutely except a few of their own sensations and mental processes, but none deny that they have innumerable ideas which they obtain by comparison. Thus, men in general, can compare themselves one with another, with the saints of whom I am speaking, and who are above them, with the animals who are below them, and with malignant-minded diabolical men who are below the animals, and in this way they can arrive at a great deal of relative knowledge.

The saints do not always live to a great age. The fire of life burns too bright. And yet they do sometimes.

Bats, newts, abstract thinkers, and other cold-blooded creatures, sometimes live for a very long time.

Human cold-blooded creatures disbelieve in the Christian passions.

People who are without some of the qualities of human nature not only are without it, but as Mr. Herbert Spencer admirably shows in the *Contemporary Review*, they cannot understand that they are without it, however great their intelligence may be in other respects. If a man has no capacity to feel, for instance, "gratitude," "musical harmony," "reverence" &c., the meanings even of these terms cannot be taught him. "Virtue and goodness to the vile, seem vile," says Shakespear. Perhaps it would be truer to say virtue and goodness to the vile seem meaningless. There never was a man more liberal or more open to new ideas than the Rev. Sidney Smith, and yet because he could not himself see any beauty in musical harmony, he denied in his lecture on the beautiful, that it has any beauty.

Of course, when I talk of Christianity, I do not mean this or that supposed form of it, but the religion of Christ. Lessing said, "Christianity has Lessing. been tried for eighteen hundred years, the religion of Christ has yet to be tried." I suppose he meant on any extended scale. He would not have denied that it has been tried by individuals.

Goethe said that nothing higher than Christianity Goethe. would or could ever be taught. I need not say that when he said this he was not thinking of Calvinistic persuasions * however suited they may be to some stages of the human mind. Nor was he thinking of embroidered ecclesiastical petticoats, however proper they may be from some points of view. Goethe

A clever utilitarian London newspaper condemns a distinguished statesman, because there is a religious side to his character. I have no doubt that to the writer of the article "religiousness" is a word altogether without meaning.

I say that none enjoy life so much as the saints, but of course they suffer more grief also. Grief is disappointed joy so he only can mourn, who can rejoice. The man who can only rejoice over a good dinner, can only mourn over a bad one.

* No doubt one reason why people took to Calvinism instead of Christianity, was that it was so much the easier of the two. To keep the world, the flesh, and the devil, in their proper places—to keep the passions of pride, vanity, sensuality, hatred, envy, &c., in subjection to the Christian passions is extremely difficult. Whereas comparatively little difficulty was found in believing in the damnation of everybody except oneself. And when, in addition to this facility, we consider the peace and sweet contentment, this creed seems always at once to have imparted the popularity of it may be considered to be in a great degree accounted for. Still this is merely a hint. Circumstances and causes are so infinitely complex, that not even the simplest matter in the world can really be explained under two volumes 8vo. of close print.

himself was no saint, but he had a marvellous faculty for seeing truth, whether he could live it or not.

Politicians may be sure that it is not so easy to improve upon God's ways of doing things as they seem to think. If foolish people arbitrarily interfere with the natural working of things, no power on earth can prevent suffering resulting from this interference, and that just in proportion to the amount of foolishness.

To give one illustration out of millions.

It is nature's intention that all young creatures should run and jump about in natural ways, and to a very considerable degree. Amongst the richer classes, girls are often not allowed to do so. The consequence is they grow up with crooked spines. Boys are allowed to be natural, and so they do not grow up with crooked spines. Wise people know truth when they see it. Others want authority. So I must say that I get the above facts from Sir James Paget. When governments interfere too much with liberty or the natural working of things in a nation, nothing can prevent its spine becoming crooked.

It is impossible to account, with certainty, for the rise and fall of nations. But it is very probable that the down-hill tendency of the French nation, ever since the first revolution, may have arisen, in a great measure, from interference with liberty, or the natural working of things; from sacrificing liberty to equality; either one of which destroys the other. Equality, if it can be got at all, can only be got by enacting arbitrary laws of legislation,

custom or public opinion preventing inequality. Liberty can only be got by allowing inequality ; by allowing the inequality which must come when people are left to be free in thought, word, and deed. Nature's intention says, that no two things, animals or persons, shall be alike ; also, that the better shall supersede the worse, and thus deterioration be prevented. These are what are called nature's intentions ; or to put it after the manner of M. Comte, these are the phenomena presented to the observation of mankind ; or to put it in the manner I prefer, these are the laws of God. Foolish people, on the other hand, say that all men shall be alike, and that sameness monotony and uniformity shall be law. They legislate with this view, and deteriorate their race by doing so. Savage Landor says, that there is more variety of nature and character in one English family than in the whole French nation. The English have, hitherto, preferred liberty to equality, and consequently are superseding all other races on this planet. Equality means sameness, tameness, and want of spontaneous self-dependent energy. But what is a country without the latter ?

One consequence of these national differences is, that Englishmen can colonize a new country, whilst a Frenchman cannot do so.

An Englishman, with energetic self-dependence, goes into the bush with his axe, by himself, and sets to work.

A Frenchman gathers together many other Frenchmen, more helpless than himself, and talks ; and very pleasant they make themselves.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

In the accounts of the early French emigrants to Canada, I have read that, in one settlement, their first measure was to erect a "salon de danse." But one evening when they were all earnestly engaged upon a minuet, a party of Indians came and scalped every one of them.

Hatred of liberty is a fatal bar to progress, either in an individual or a nation.

Saying that it is God's intention that imbecile-charactered creatures should kill themselves by the unchecked indulgence of their desires ; that this is the way deterioration of the human race is prevented ; and that it is not the business of parliament to prevent it, inasmuch as it is not the business of parliament to teach men Christian religiousness, which is the only influence that can tell upon these poor wretches,—all this will be considered by many very shocking, but, as I have shown in my introductory observation, the one advantage an amateur author has over professionals is that, having no motive to do otherwise, he can tell the truth without scruple.

Anglo-Sax-
ons.

Expediency and utilitarianism are partly matters of race. Wherever the Anglo-Saxon is found, from the first dawning of civilized society, to the highest developments of civilized governments, the same tendency may be observed.

Anecdote.

A settlement in the western parts of America has, at first, no law but lynch law. A shoemaker commits a murder. Judge Lynch condemns him to be hanged. At the last moment it is discovered that he is the only shoemaker in the place ; so they hang a tailor instead. There are two tailors.

Now, there is no doubt that, from the expediency point of view, they did the right thing. The immediate utility and advantage to the community was undoubted. And yet they were really wrong. The ultimate consequences were disastrous. The dawning sense of justice and morality in the community received a check. Lynch law lost its terrors. Crime reigned supreme. The settlement got a bad name ; and its progress was thrown back for years.

As a rule, everything turns out differently from what is expected. The only probabilities are improbable events. All that the wisest man can foresee is, that events are certain to be different from what he expects them to be. Mr. Herbert Spencer's writings on this subject, in the *Contemporary Review*, are most excellent. But, if his views are true, the moral is, that people should act upon principle, or, by what is right, not upon expediency. The latter always fails in its object. The former has been proved by thousands of years of experience, even if by nothing else. Principle, or right, may be defined, with some truth, to be in-born convictions and habits of mind, derived from the experience of ages. Expediency may be defined to be, "guesses about the future by fanciful politicians or philosophers, no two of whom agree." The possibility of human society arises from the very little effect even the worst governments really have. Governments, composed of a few hundreds of people, who occupy themselves about laws, alternately enacting and repealing them ; collecting money ; paying bills ; making public speeches ;

Principle and
Expediency.

whipping, hanging, shooting, cutting the ears off, torturing, or shutting up, according to the country and era evil doers, are, of course, absolutely necessary, to keep in check these evil doers, whether domestic or foreign. But, all the time, the millions and millions who comprise nations, and who are not evil doers. quietly carry on the real business of life, according to the natural working of things. The former produce most of the materials, which form the ground-work of those entertaining works of imagination that come under the general term, "history." The latter do the work wanted on this planet.

Napoleon and
Goethe on
History.

Napoleon said, "history means tricks we play the dead." Goethe said, "the spirit of history means the spirit of this or that ingenious gentleman who writes about what he calls history."

Sir Robert Walpole used, in his old age, to say to his friends, "read to me something—not history, that must be lies."

I think, then, it may be laid down as a rule, without fear of contradiction, that a government never meddles without muddling. Of course, some things a government must undertake. A country must have soldiers, sailors, policemen, and judges. But, in providing these, the law still holds good. "A government must muddle."* But that is no

* Why governments, which are composed, generally, of rather clever and intelligent men, should muddle everything so very much, may not seem very clear; but a leading article in the *Times* had a good observation on the subject the other day, showing that an assembly composed of clever men will often corporally propound an

reason for their meddling when it is not necessary, The soldiers, sailors, policemen, and judges ought to be infinitely more effective than they are; but then the country should, for the most part, be left to itself.

I fear we are far from this Utopian state. In the mean-time much legislation will be necessary, not to meddle, but to prevent meddling, by some "imperium in imperio." To prevent narrow cliques, classes, professions, and other assemblages of men from interfering with the free action of their own members and of others. Also, to do away with all impediments to liberty of barter, and to the natural working of things. Corn growers tried to compel people to buy corn at their shops. Grocers try to compel people to buy tea at their shops. A piece of land

opinion that to each of them, individually, is incomprehensible, and that they will, also, often corporally come to a conclusion that each one by himself vigorously condemns. Why this is so, it might be difficult to say. Perhaps it is an ultimate fact, behind which one cannot get; but the truth of it must be manifest to everybody.

This principle will account for the general want of success in the long-run of co-operative associations. When the business is mere routine work, like the management of a grocery, it may succeed. Little is wanted beyond the industrious, saving, and punctual qualities of ants and bees. But where the continual exercise of intelligence, foresight, and thought, under constantly novel circumstances is wanted, a company has no chance against an individual. A clever cotton manufacturer buys his cotton at the right time, place, and price. A co-operative association, even composed of equally clever individuals, would always buy their cotton at the wrong time, place, and price. A clever farmer cuts his crop at the right time and in the right way. A co-operative farming association would always cut their crop at the wrong time and in the wrong way.

instead of being easy as a cow to sell, takes six months to dispose of. The trade unionist tells a man that if he does not join their union, his tools shall be taken away from him, his means of livelihood destroyed, or his wife and children blown up with gunpowder. The employer tells a man that if he does join the trade union, he shall have no employment, and his wife and children shall starve. Professions enact arbitrary and often ridiculous rules, interfering with the liberty of their individual members. These are merely a few instances of meddling and tyranny of narrow-minded people, which will require legislation for some time to come, even in countries which think themselves civilized.

Stern enforcement of contracts or solemn promises is of course a duty of Government.

A man who breaks his contract or engagement to do a thing, has told a lie. Plato thought a lie the worst of all crimes. The definition of the devil is "the father of lies." In other words, lying for the good of self, and the harm of others, is the essence of the evil principle in men.

The business of a country is best carried on by every individual in it working his best for his own interest. To give one out of innumerable instances. This is the way London is supplied with food. Conceive the predicament we should all be in, if we had to depend for our daily dinners upon a constitutional Government. No fish one day, no cabbages the next. Butchers meat in plenty ; vegetables to eat with it supplied by the contractors a week or two afterwards. No beer to be had. Why ? Pressure

upon Government on the subject. Not a potato to be got for love or money. Why? Potato contractor has swindled her Majesty's Government—gone off to America, and left the Metropolis potatoless.

These are only a few of the innumerable disasters that would be of daily occurrence.

The greatness of a country rests upon the active self-dependence, energy, and self-control of its individual inhabitants. Every interference of a Government takes something away from these things. Government
Meddle.

The "meddle" does not end in mere confused muddle. It generally brings about the very evils it wishes to prevent, as Mr. Spencer shows. Instances of
this.

Governments have forbidden books containing obnoxious opinions. Their doing so, spread these opinions.

Governments, for the benefit of borrowers, have forbidden a high rate of interest. Their doing so compelled those who borrowed to pay a still higher rate of interest.

Governments, to keep down the price of bread, have made it penal to buy grain in order to sell it again. Their doing so has enormously increased the price of bread.

It would be unreasonable to expect Governments, composed as they usually are of active-minded men, to abstain from meddling; but still, if Mr. Spencer's teaching is correct, that the effect produced by measures usually turns out to be exactly opposite to what is intended, it must surely be right to legislate in accordance with that teaching.

I will try to hint at what I mean, by means of an illustrative anecdote.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

A short time ago, a volunteer artillery company were practising near a village to the north of London, but much of the shot and shell fell in the village itself, ploughing up the Rector's garden, tearing up the village green, and laying low the tombstones in the church-yard. The target was a quarter of a mile to the right of the village. The inhabitants were naturally rather agitated, and so they drew up a petition to the commanding officer, humbly praying that, out of consideration for the safety of themselves and their houses, the men might be ordered to aim their guns not at the target but at the village.

A few more instances of government muddling.

Joanna Stephens, in 1738, discovered an invaluable nostrum for all diseases, which she offered to the government for £5000. The grant was made, and the nostrum turned out to be compounded egg shells, snails, soap, swine-cresships, haws, and honey.

Most people have heard of the Act of Parliament ordaining

- (1) That Greenwich hospital was to be re-built.
- (2) That the new building was to be constructed out of the materials of the old one.
- (3) That the old hospital was to be left standing until such time as the new one should be completed.

During the cattle plague, the helplessness of the Government in the hands of the cattle doctors was very amusing, and the orders in council upon the subject rich beyond measure.

“No animals to be moved from place to place without a magistrate’s order.” Poor women had to trudge ten miles before they could take their pig from one side of the street to the other.

“No hay to be taken about the country for fear of imparting infection.” Animals died of starvation. They had nothing to eat.

“No manure to be removed from London.” This order had simply to be disregarded to prevent pestilence.

At the present moment, the Government of Great Britain prohibits the importation of cattle from fear of introducing that terrible *Continental* complaint, rinderpest; whilst Denmark is prohibiting the importation of cattle for fear of introducing that terrible *English* complaint, rinderpest.

Instances of
Government
Imbecility.

Governments, and their doings, are always reminding me of children and their little ways.

In England, Russia is supposed to be the chief culprit.

What do you mean Master Bruin, says Mrs. Europe, by spreading that terrible disease of yours all over the world?

Please M’m, I did not do it M’m, Master Bull did it.

What do you mean, Master Bull, by spreading that terrible disease of yours all over the world?

Please M’m, I did not do it M’m, Master Bruin did it.

There is just now a great outcry made, and with justice, about the scarcity of live stock in England, and the impossibility of obtaining it. There are

two ways of obtaining live stock, importation and breeding, but neither of these ways is just now permitted by her Majesty's government.

In unhealthy seasons, when there is much disease amongst cattle, farmers are not allowed by her Majesty's government to move their cows about the country for fear of contagion.

Another
Instance.

The majority of farmers do not keep bulls. Whether her Majesty's government is aware that cattle breeding and bulls have anything to do with each other it is impossible to say. I myself, judging from the legislation on the subject to which I am referring, believe that they are not aware of it. But if so, it is most reprehensible in them to legislate without first ascertaining the truth about the matter. There could have been no difficulty in obtaining ample evidence ; and, if still unsatisfied, they might surely have appointed a committee.

Another
Instance.

About thirty years ago, the British government decreed that the island of Alderney should have a harbour. It was not considered likely that any ship would ever make use of it, but that was no matter. The harbour was accordingly commenced, and is now completed, at a cost of two million pounds ; but it is a source of great embarrassment. The present Government clearly see the necessity there is that it should be destroyed, but they despair of inducing the House of Commons to vote the very large sum of money that would be necessary for that purpose. In this emergency the government is advised, that in all probability the storms and the waves will, in no long time, do the business without their incurring

Anecdote.

any expense. They have therefore at length decided to spend for the next three or four years a sum not exceeding £8000 in keeping the harbour in repair, hoping by that time they will be in a position to judge whether the waves and the storms are likely to have the effect that is anticipated.

From time immemorial, the roads on the east coast of Yorkshire have been mended with sea gravel.

Another instance of Government Imbecility.

The German ocean encroaches upon, and carries away yearly, a certain portion of this coast.

A storm comes and heaps up along the whole length of it six feet depth of sand and shingle. Another storm comes and carries it all away again. Where to? Perhaps Devonshire, amongst other places. A sailor drowned near Scarbro' was found a few days afterwards on the coast of Kent.

The Atlantic ocean once made a serious inroad into a celebrated Mrs. Partington's domain; so she seized her mop and did her best with it; but the result was not altogether satisfactory.

Well, a year or two ago, it came into the head of the Mrs. Partington, to whose department of government the matter belonged, that if the farmers of the east riding were prevented from taking for their roads the shingle (which is brought up from the sands on the backs of donkeys) the encroachment would no longer take place; and an edict to that effect was accordingly issued. The prohibition causes a great loss to the farming community, for now they have nothing to mend their roads with, but the yellow clay of the country; still, it really is almost worth it for the fun of the thing.

A great moral philosopher says, that incongruity is the principle ingredient wanted to produce laughter ; that no one would laugh to see a dustman bespattered all over with mud, but to see the same thing happen to a bishop in full canonicals would be irresistible. If this is so, I suppose, what makes one laugh in such cases as the above shingle question, is the incongruity between the sort of Godlike standard of intelligence men profess to reach, and the helplessness they really show when they try to exercise it.

Another
Instance.

I do not pay very much attention to the smaller political matters ; but still I think I can remember that, not many years ago, the British government disfranchised a borough for having been bribed and corrupted, and made a baronet of a man for having bribed and corrupted it.

George
Hurry.

A few months ago, the law (that is the Government) condemned a man, named George Hurry, for not calling in a doctor when his child was ill. The comment of the *Saturday Review* was as follows :

Saturday
Review.

“ It would be an act of tyranny to force a man to take medicine, if he did not believe in its efficacy. Indeed it is an open question whether he would not usually be right. It is a delicate problem whether the health of the world would be improved or deteriorated by the extermination of all doctors.” For myself, I must say it seems (to use a familiar expression) coming it rather strong for a government to force a man to force his child to take a dose of physic, especially as opposite medical sects would

dispute as to whether it should take any physic at all, and those who said it should would not agree as to what the physic should be.

The doctors are like the grocers, who want the Government to compel the public to buy tea at their shops instead of at the co-operative stores. And really, if government interferes in the one case, why not in the other? A man cures his own child instead of getting a doctor to do it. The government punishes him for doing so. A man mends his own trousers instead of getting the tailor to do it. Then why not punish him too. I dwell on this because the law might really be very embarrassing some day to me as a magistrate.

Supposing, for instance, Dr. A. comes to me for a summons against a man who had neglected to send for him when his child was ill. I grant it. Next day, Dr. B. comes and tells me that Dr. A.'s medical opinions are heretical, and I must grant the summons to him. I grant it. And now we will shift the scene to the court of sessions, the week afterwards, and will suppose the two doctors and the malefactor before the magistrates, each doctor armed with his summons and protected by a sufficient body of policemen from all chance of molestation on the part of the dangerous criminal. A dialogue, somewhat, to the following effect would probably take place.

Chairman: I understand Dr. A. that you got a summons against this man, notwithstanding that you are an unqualified practitioner.

Dr. A.: But I am not an unqualified practitioner.

Chairman : I thought Dr. B. you stated to Mr. C—— that Dr. A. was an unqualified practitioner.

Dr. B. : He is not unqualified, but his practice is faulty. He sometimes uses what are called homœopathic remedies, and generally he does not give strong enough medicines.

Chairman : Is this true Dr. B. ?

Dr. B. : No, it is not true that my medicines are not strong enough. But the fact is, Dr. A.'s medicines are too strong.

Now, what are the magistrates to do. The only case in point I can think of is, that of the judgment of Solomon, but as this solution would, perhaps, not be altogether suited to the present time, perhaps the best decision for the magistrates to arrive at would be, for the doctors to toss up for the patient. Still, I must repeat that the question would be a very embarrassing one.

The whole thing is as ridiculous as any of the stories of state prosecutions in the middle ages, that one reads of.

Pig tried for
Manslaughter.

In the year 1341, a trial took place of a sow and her litter of pigs for killing and eating a child. They were proceeded against by the public prosecutor of the day. The old sow was condemned to death, but the little pigs were pardoned on plea of their tender years and the bad example that had been set them.

The Government decrees compulsory Vaccination because many people die of small-pox ; but enormously more die of over-eating ; then why not

compulsory limitation of food. Many die of small-pox; but enormously more die of evils that ensue from a common cold; then why not compulsory flannel waistcoats and compulsory night caps. In the northern parts of our island, a terribly irritating and undoubtedly contagious complaint is said to be very common. Then why not compulsory and periodical examinations of our Caledonian neighbours by state-paid and competent medical inspectors. Government of this sort is called paternal. It ought to be called grand-maternal.

All the legislation that takes place about diseases, is simply due to the fact that the gentlemen who form her Majesty's governments are dupes of the doctors, who, as Dr. Dickson says, have a great pecuniary interest in keeping up exaggerated ideas about infection and contagion. Those who see all this clearly, and write upon the subject in the newspapers, often use very strong language with reference to these gentlemen. But men cannot help being dupes. There is nothing morally wrong in it, and therefore strong language is quite out of place.

One word about homœopathy.

I wonder whether the little medical world is Homœopathy aware of the amusement it affords the great world, by its bickerings and distinctions, that require the microscopic eyes of professional jealousy to distinguish. To the unprofessional, the practice of some allopaths appears to differ so exceedingly little from that of some homœopaths, that the refusal of such men to meet each other in consultation, seems as

funny as for Dr. A. to refuse to meet Dr. B. because one prescribes scammony as a medicine, whilst the other prescribes jalap.

When people hear of wars and rumours of wars between contending medical sects, they cannot help remembering Swift's great controversy, which distracted the whole nation, between the big endians and the little endians (that is, whether the egg ought to be eaten at the big or little end). What a pity it is that doctors, instead of quarrelling among themselves, should not be always ready to join each other in trying to do some good in the world, and endeavouring to diminish, as far as in them lies, the misery that is in it. I am not so Utopian as to expect from the majority of a profession any more than from the majority of mankind in general any great degree of transcendental disinterestedness, or sacrifice of private interests. Still, the medical profession have vast opportunities of alleviating suffering, and to see them throwing these opportunities away, to make room for little etiquettes, is very painful to a compassionate minded man. It is not even as if medicine were an established science ; but it is not. Conformists differ far more amongst each other than some conformists, and some nonconformists. No, it is in the name chiefly. Like the Homooisians and the Homoousians of the middle ages, who consigned each other to eternal perdition, not because their opinions differed, for practically they were the same, but because one sect called itself Homoousians and the other sect called itself Homooisians.

Every allopathic medical man I ever talked to on subject, has allowed that homœopathy has done much good, by proving practically by its success the fatal consequences of too violent modes of treatment; and yet, these very men refuse to act with homœopathists, because these lives they have saved, were saved in a manner contrary to rule.

Some English soldiers once stormed a fort and took it from the Chinese. The Emperor of China ordered Wang, the Chinese commandant of the fort, to be beheaded for allowing it to be taken. But Wang said, the English had not fought fairly; that they had fought in a manner contrary to rule, and got over the walls by a back way. Upon this, the Emperor spared his life, merely ordering that his ears should be cut off, and that he should be hung up for a few years in a cage.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

A government must muddle. How in medical matters, for instance, can it possibly obtain the requisite knowledge for legislating to any good purpose, when no two of the authorities they must consult agree, and without consulting supposed experts I need hardly say, that the knowledge of government officials is apt to be, to say the least, limited.

Government
must muddle.

An American secretary to the admiralty (answering, I suppose, to our first lord) one day in his official capacity had to visit some ship. As soon as he got on board he went to the hatchway and looked down. "Why the darned thing's hollow," he exclaimed in the utmost astonishment. The fact was, though of course he had often seen ships from

Illustrative
Anecdote.

the shore, it had never occurred to him before that this was the case.

A paternal government implies a childish people. Treat people as if they were childish and they will become so. I understand that there is a bill before parliament to prevent persons from using soap when they bathe in the Serpentine. A year ago there was a bill before parliament to provide foot warmers in railway carriages. Mr. W. V. Harcourt, in an excellent speech not long ago said, he was always expecting a bill to compel everybody to wear flannel night-caps when they went to bed, to ensure them from catching cold.

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

"The only thing I know is, that I know nothing."—SOCRATES.

Here will be no chance for medicine becoming a science till it has got rid of its superstitions; till it has learned that diseases are not positive entities; till it has learned how extremely exaggerated and absurd its present ideas are about infection; till it has cured itself of the ridiculous superstition that every disease is caused by its own separate invisible, malignant, and diabolical animalcule; till it has learned that though classifying symptoms of various derangements of body under heads is convenient, there is, in truth, no more line to be drawn between one so-called disease and its neighbouring one,* than there is between orange and yellow, every disease or

Medical Su-
perstition.

* A line can no more be drawn between the bundle of symptoms representing one so-called disease and another, than it can between the animal and vegetable worlds. And yet we must have classification for convenience. Sidney Smith gave us a sad illustration of the necessity classification is to the human mind. It was after the discovery of the Australian duck billed Platypus. He says, that the latter part of the naturalist Dr. Smith's life was rendered miserable, because he could not determine whether the creature was a bird or a beast.

bundle of symptoms dove-tailing into the neighbouring bundles of symptoms, just as each prismatic colour dove-tails into the colours on each side of it. Lastly, there will be no hope for medicine till it has learned that great as is the effect of body on mind, it is as nothing when compared with the effect of mind on body; and when I say mind, I mean that vital principle which, whether actually made of matter or spirit, (whatever matter or spirit may be) is not, never has been, and never will be understood, or in any way analyzed or comprehended by mortal man.

Enthusiastic physiologists expect to explain "life." Some indeed seem to think they can almost do it already. But this is only that kind of slight monomania, which always comes from one-sided, or exclusive devotion to a hobby. A hobby (or exclusive devotion to one subject) often creates happiness, but it always destroys judgment, more or less.

Mr. Lecky. Mr. Lecky says, that "when all the motions of the heavenly bodies have been reduced to the dominion of gravitation, gravitation itself remains an insoluble problem. What "life" is, science is utterly unable to say. In grouping phenomena or appearances, its achievements have been great. In discovering ultimate causes, it has absolutely failed. An impenetrable mystery lies at the root of every existing thing. We know next to nothing of the relation of mind to matter, and to suppose that the tendency of science is to eliminate the conception of the first cause from creation, is completely to ignore the sphere and limits to which it is confined."

Charles Lamb defines knowledge as "our ignorance classified." Chas. Lamb.

Sir W. Hamilton says, "that human knowledge is like a farthing rushlight, surrounded by an infinite expanse of darkness." Sir W. Hamilton on human knowledge.

Archdeacon Hare says, "the higher we rise in knowledge, the vaster is the extent of ignorance before us. Men are always foolishly believing themselves approaching the end, but they will be no nearer the end in a thousand years.*"

* Dr. Maudesley says, "the regions of the wonderful are becoming less and less as science advances." Now what an astounding thing this is for a clever man to say. That the revelations made by microscopes and telescopes tend to diminish the sense of wonder! The former shows us, according to the well known couplet, that

All things that live have little fleas to bite 'em,
And these again have lesser fleas, and so add infinitum.

And yet, according to Dr. Maudesley, the knowledge of this endless series is no more wonderful than that merely of the one parasite so well known amongst the less civilized races of men. Again, science tells us that the heavens above us consist of worlds infinite in number and infinite in distances, and that amongst these endless worlds, our earth, in addition to its own revolutions, accompanies the sun and all the planets at an inconceivable rate through space, where to, and where from, none can tell; and yet, according to Dr. Maudesley, this knowledge is less calculated to create wonder than the beliefs of the ancients that the earth was a stationary plane, and that the stars were lamps to give light to it, fixed in a solid firmament, a mile or two distant, which revolved round this plane once in twenty-four hours.

I only mention this, because Dr. Maudesley's point of view seems to be not an uncommon one amongst men of science, whose ideas about what is wonderful and miraculous always seem to me very curious. Supposing the inhabitants of the earth had always lived with no light but that of the stars, and all at once, for one day, and

Sir W. Hamilton also says, "the highest knowledge is consciousness of ignorance;" and "our

only one day, the sun had risen in the east and in twelve hours set again in the west, they would call this wonderful and miraculous; but the infinitely more wonderful and miraculous fact of a similar thing happening every day, for thousands of years, they seem to think nothing of. Emerson says, it is a sign of genius to see the miraculous in the common; but, I think, very ordinary common sense is sufficient.

When one considers that wonderful as the sun, stars, and galaxies are, the flea's flea is infinitely the more wonderful thing of the two, being living instead of dead matter, and again, that a living man is infinitely more wonderful still, the above assertion of Dr. Maudesley, and the scientific men of the period becomes astonishing.

That matter should walk, move, and feel at all is marvellous. That it should experience the joy and bliss of which men are capable, is so utterly astounding, that there is nothing for it but dumbfounded amazement, and adoration of the Author of all this bliss. Then how about the misery of human life? As an exceptional thing it is terrible. Looking on the human race as a whole, the talk about it is nonsense; sheer nonsense; the talk itself arising out of the simple fact that men are conscious of their exceptional unhappiness, and therefore can talk about it, whilst they are not conscious of their normal happiness, and therefore cannot talk about it.

Emerson says, "a man admires a beautiful thing. He thinks about his feeling of admiration; he analyzes it and the beauty is gone."

Mr. Dallas, in "the Gay Science," says, "we can describe every kind of wickedness and woe, but all we can say of bliss is, that it is unutterable."

Again, "life is destroyed by thinking of it."

Again, "in health the sense of existence vanishes. Except we suffer, we scarcely dream of our being."

Again, "self consciousness culminates in suicide."

Again, "outside of consciousness there rolls a vast tide of life which is far more important than the little isle of our thoughts which lies within our ken."

Wordsworth says, "thought was not in enjoyment it expired."

dream of knowledge is a little light surrounded by darkness.”*

C. Tennyson says, “the consciousness of life must fade, before the bliss it yields be felt at all.”

Self-consciousness kills even thought.

A man consciously tries in vain to remember a word. Unconscious thought recalls it at once.

The author of “*Ecce Homo*” says, “self-consciousness and sensualism are enemies of true delight.”

Goethe, looking back on his past life, said, that he had spent very few happy days. Now, in the first place, I do not believe him; and in the second place, he was a man eaten up with self-consciousness.

Perhaps there is no fool like the epicurean fool. For he defeats his own object, which is enjoyment, by the very means he takes to secure it, that is, conscious search for enjoyment. The author of “*Ecce Homo*” says, that the very birds and beasts enjoy their food more than the epicurean enjoys his, simply because they do not aim at, or think of their enjoyment. This arises from what he calls the paradox, that no man is so happy as he who does not aim at happiness.

Some rich people, who are idle, are undoubtedly often thoroughly miserable; so also are vicious people; but the mass of mankind are neither rich nor vicious.

* Sir Isaac Newton said, “man’s search for knowledge is like a child picking up sand on the sea shore, grain by grain;” so I suppose it is only the second-rate men of science who believe that men can really comprehend anything.

No one thing can ever be looked on in its absolutely full and true light, unless everything else in the universe be grasped and comprehended at the same moment with reference to it, for the universe has no unconnected parts. It is impossible to look upon even so simple a thing as a lump of chalk in a perfectly and fully true light, without knowing all knowledge on all subjects, in all worlds, in all time, and being able to grasp and comprehend all this knowledge with reference to, and at the moment of contemplating the lump of chalk in question; for a part cannot be fully understood without the whole of which it is a part being comprehended at the same time with reference to it.

Tennyson says, "we have but faith—we cannot know." Pascal says, "*notre intelligence tient dans l'ordre des choses intelligibles le même rang que notre corps dans l'étendue de la nature.*" Sir John Lubbock says, "civilization is in its infancy." Dr. Arnold says, "I consider as superstition the imagined knowledge and certainty which men suppose they have of the laws of nature."

Laplace says, "*Ce que nous connaissons est peu de chose, ce que nous ignorons est immense.*"

Shakespear says, "the fool doth think himself wise, but the wise man knows himself to be a fool."

Montaign says, "confession of ignorance is the surest sign of wisdom. I know."

Use of science What is the use of science? Most likely in the end incalculably great. That is, the results will be a far larger crop of the fruits of the Spirit than usually grow now. If, at present, the fruits often seem more of the nature of conceit and irreligiousness, that no doubt is due to science being in its infancy. Kant, Coleridge, and Bacon say, and Pope implies, that a little knowledge tends to deteriorate the character, whilst a great deal has a contrary effect. In itself, the knowledge that Sirius is bigger than the sun is not a jot more important than the knowledge that a pumpkin is bigger than a potato; but if the former leads more than the latter to its possessor experiencing awe, wonder, and reverence towards the Creator of these suns, the superiority of the first piece of knowledge becomes infinite.

In consequence of Vaccination and other causes, many people, in talking of the medical profession, often allow themselves to make use of very strong and even violent language; and in the cases of those whose children have been killed by Vaccination, this is hardly to be wondered at. Still, one or two considerations on the other side might be useful.

"None so blind as those who won't see," is true generally of the profession, in regard to the deaths, diseases, and skin affections, that so often follow Vaccination. This must, I suppose, be granted.

On the other hand, we must remember that hundreds of regular practitioners courageously run counter to the view of their professional brethren, and conscientiously refuse to practise the rite. He will appreciate this who comprehends the great force exercised by professional clanism, esprit de corps, trade unionism, or by whatever other name it may be called.

The profession tend to the discouragement of sanitary measures, from (of course unconsciously) interested motives. I suppose we must grant this too.

All honour then to men, who, like Dr. Angus Dr. A. Smith.
Smith, Dr. Hawksly, and others, devote their time and talents to the encouragement of these measures.*

According to opinions I have quoted above of eminent physicians, medicine up to about the present

*I only mention these names because in my very small acquaintance with matters relating to medical men I can think of no others, but I know there are hundreds more.

time has been more fatal to the human race than all pestilences and wars put together. This, too, I suppose we must grant.

Signs of better things.

On the other hand, we must remember the signs there are of better things ; that skilful surgery is already an almost unmitigated blessing ; that bodily pain during operations is almost banished ; that at any rate half-a-dozen or so drugs are undoubtedly useful when used judiciously ; that many of the regular practitioners are following homœopathists and other nonconformists in turning their attention instead of solely to drugs, to those infinitely more important things, diet and general hygienic measures ; and that some are even beginning to understand beforehand something about constitutional peculiarities without having to depend upon experiments, whereby the patients have so often been killed before these peculiarities have been learned.

When I think of these things, I cannot help looking forward to the time when therapeutics will deserve to be ranked amongst the sciences.

Correct diagnosis necessary.

Again, we must not fail to recognize the value of classification of symptoms of bodily derangement, that is, of what people call diseases, and which has been carried out so elaborately. It may not be considered by short-sighted people very satisfactory, when they are ill and want to be cured, only to be told what is the matter with them ; still diagnosis, as I think it is called, is a very valuable and necessary preliminary step in medicine. At any rate it prevents ridiculously incongruous treatment.

I once knew a country farrier blister a horse violently in the shoulder for that kind of gouty affection in the foot, to which pampered horses are just as liable as pampered men.

Illustrative
Anecdote.

Another horse doctor, for an affection of the eyes threatening blindness, inserted a seaton near the root of the tail on the left hand side.

Now, if in these cases the diagnosis had been correct the two animals would have been spared much needless suffering.

When one considers the deaths, diseases, and misery caused amongst the poor * by Vaccination, it is very difficult to restrain one's righteous indignation ; in fact, it ought not to be restrained. Compassion for suffering, and indignation at the cause of it, are about the strongest feelings that reign in souls of the higher order. The ideal but difficult frame of mind to arrive at, is the combination of indignation against pernicious doctrines with pity for the poor fool who holds them ; and in cases of moral wrong, indignation against all scoundrelism with pity for the poor scoundrel himself.

Leigh Hunt says, that scoundrels ought to be happy in the next world since they are so wretched in this. But this is only partially true. Of course, a real scoundrel is incapable of genuine happiness. Still, if he is a consistent utilitarian, and an intelligent and temperate epicurean, with a good digestion,

Leigh Hunt.

* Amongst the well fed and well cared for children of the richer classes fatal " disasters " from Vaccination are very rare, but it is far otherwise amongst the poor.

he will often pass the greater part of his life almost completely without positive wretchedness.

Such is, as I say, the strong feeling just now entertained in a large portion of the population against the conformist part of the medical profession, that I know I shall be blamed for writing of them in the apologetic manner I have done. But the few doctors with whom I am acquainted are almost without exception, such excellent kind-hearted men, that I cannot help being biased, perhaps unduly, in favour of the whole profession. Still, I do not think this bias has led me into any error of statement, though it cannot have failed to cast a eulogistic colouring over what I have written.

On the other hand, I have actually been charged by one or two of the more foolish of my friends with entertaining feelings of hostility towards medicine as a profession. So far is this from being the case, that, with one exception, I seriously maintain that medicine ought to be the highest calling in the world; that is, the calling that more than all others ought to lead to the alleviation of human suffering. This is the reason why I take so much interest in it. I say, "with one exception;" for of course, spiritual good comes before bodily good. Still, they are very closely connected. So closely, indeed, that I sometimes fancy that when the island of Utopia is discovered, the clerical and medical professions will be found to be combined in one. It is impossible that a doctor can be really efficient, unless he thoroughly understands the wonderful influence the mind exercises over the body, and is qualified to

Medicine as
practised in
Utopia.

prescribe and administer to his patient the curative remedies of spiritual appliances. But this is a mere imaginative dream, in ludicrous contrast to existing fact.

I will recapitulate the charges brought against the profession. Not the rank and file, these are but sheep that are led astray. The majority of doctors are excellent kind-hearted conscientious people, highly unqualified to do their own thinking upon any difficult matter. No, it is only against the leaders of medical opinion that the following charges should be brought.

Charges
against the
medical
profession.

(1.) That whereas the first duty of the profession is to instruct the community in the laws of health and thus prevent disease, and only the second one to cure it; their tendency has generally been to depreciate the importance of sanitary measures, thus making themselves indirectly answerable for a vast amount of the pestilence that has existed in the world.

(2.) That they have encouraged the superstition, that having had a disease once secures a person against having it again for the rest of his life; their (no doubt unconscious) object being to keep up the proofs on which Vaccination and the enormous profits accruing from it principally rest.

(3.) That they have always done all in their power to induce people to believe in the germ theory of disease, their (probably unconscious) object being, to make the public believe that the atmosphere being full of these germs even to the tops of mountains, disease is beyond control by sanitary means and can

only be reached by resorting to inoculation, Vaccination, extract of toads, weasles, boiled snails, or whatever may be the fashionable nostrum of the day.

(4.) That they encourage the ridiculously exaggerated notions which exist about infection with the same (perhaps unconscious) view of keeping up beliefs that induce to their pecuniary advantage.

(5.) That they teach that patients in almost all diseases are to be dieted on great quantities of wine and spirits. We need not go into the (in all probability unconscious) motives for this. I will merely hint that champagne is generally considered to be pleasanter to take than jalap, and also, that this mode of treatment, of course, encourages general drunkenness, and drunkenness is next to filth the most prolific parent of disease known.*

* I cannot doubt that of all causes of drunkenness no *oué* has been so effectual as the habit medical men have always had of recommending immoderate quantities of wine and spirits to be taken for the sake of preserving or regaining health. Some of my readers may have met with the following lines :—

Everyone knows that the doctors allow
A man, for his health, to get drunk as a sow,
One day in each month ; but which day they don't say,
So for fear I should miss it, I get drunk every day.

This, no doubt, is only an epigram, but epigrams are sometimes terribly true.

There are instances to show that, even in preparing prescriptions for external application, it is desirable to avoid alcoholic ingredients as much as possible. Porson was a very great Greek scholar, but he was sadly addicted to drink. One day his doctor sent him an

I need hardly say that if the motive here hinted at does exist, it exists quite unconsciously ; indeed, I try to believe that all the above doctrines have been taught only in consequence of the unconscious bias produced by pecuniary self-interest.

Some years ago, the Established English Church did not do its duty, so the public (who *will* be served), betook itself to Wesley and the various forms of Nonconformity.

Some years ago, the established medical sect did not do its duty, so the public (who *will* be served), betook itself to homœopathy, hydropathy, and the various forms of medical nonconformity. At any rate they got the truth from them, that diet, intemperance, indolence, and impurity, are the real causes of disease, and that the contrary to these things are the real safeguards, and that, in the ignorance which still prevails, and the utter disagreement that exists amongst medical men as to the proper use of drugs and other remedial measures, the most successful treatment of disease is, (as a rule,) the careful removal of all the impediments to the efforts nature is unceasingly making to cure what is wrong.

Homœopathy
hydropathy,
&c.

Of course, I know the very disrespectful manner doctors have of speaking about nature. Indeed, one I know called her "an old fool," in so many words. At the moment, it struck me that, considering that

external application for rheumatism ; but he had incautiously prepared it with strong spirits. Porson was in torture ; but the temptation was too great, and he drank off the embrocation without leaving a drop for the purpose intended.

Nature, "an
old fool."

"nature" is only a manner of expressing in one word the ways of God, this mode of speaking was sufficiently blasphemous. But the word blasphemy can only have a meaning to those who believe in the existence of a God. To others, of course, there is no such word. "Ten Doctors nine Atheists," says the proverb.

After all, it is only the old, old story, "there's nothing like leather." Come to me, the only real genuine professor of therapeutics in the whole world. Come to me, says the great doctor, addressing the crowd from his waggon, and I'll cure you of every evil under the sun. Don't go to mother Nature, she's an old Harridan and will kill every mother's son of you. Don't go to that Jabberwock in the next waggon there, he'll kill you quicker still with his globules and water works. Come to me, and you shall have a prophylactic that will secure you against illness to the end of time. Neglect to come to me, and you will never be free from frightful diseases for one single day of your life. Such is the fate intended and provided for you by that idiotic old fool nature.

I will just hint here at another thing which is creating great odium against the medical profession ; I mean all that is going on between the Government and medical men in the matter of what is called the Contagious Diseases Bill. The profane do not hesitate to call the whole thing jobbery, but I should be sorry to use so violent an expression. I doubt not that the evidence they all give on the subject is perfectly honest in intention, however false it may be

in fact. Writing upon this subject in the *Contemporary Review*, Mr. H. Spencer says, "We require constantly to bear in mind that personal interests affect most of the statements on which sociological conclusions are based, and on which legislation proceeds."

I gather from Mr. Spencer's article, that all the more horrible features of the disease in question arose from the treatment of it. The treatment is now better, and these worst features have more or less vanished. The doctors with pardonable zeal for the credit of their profession, assert that the disease has become milder in type.

CHAPTER X.

ADVICE TO PARENTS WHOSE CHILDREN HAVE BEEN KILLED BY VACCINATION.

"Of all the tyrannies, the tyranny of majorities is the most heartless, the most cruel, and the most implacable."

Advice to
parents.

I will now give a word of advice to those parents whose children have been killed by Vaccination.

Put the case clearly and truthfully before the public, but, although it is one of medical mal-practice and therefore actionable, if you are a poor man, avoid law. Public opinion is still in favour of Vaccination, and therefore you would only lose your money. We read that, formerly, when all the world believed in witchcraft, legal proceedings, which in any way were opposed to the popular belief, always failed. The man's own lawyers even were against him. You retain on your side, we will suppose, a man great in law. What is the consequence? He has passed his life attending to what are considered much more important matters than mere doctors' question; so he knows nothing about Vaccination. He necessarily, under the circumstances, takes the popular views about it, and naturally, therefore, thinks you half a lunatic for being in any way opposed to such a God-sent blessing; although he will do what he

believes to be his professional duty to you, and even, if he is a right kind of man, feel sincere commiseration for the weakness of your understanding, yet, he will not, and can not be expected to throw himself into your case in such a manner as to ensure, or even render probable, a successful result. Besides, yours would be a medical question, and every doctor in the country would give evidence against you. No matter what they may have said to you in private; once propose to them to say the same thing in a witness box, and all with one accord will begin to make excuse. I understand that it is one of their Professional
esprit de
corps.
professional rules never to give evidence against one of their cloth. This kind of esprit de corps is common to all trades, professions, and cliques,* and always has a good deal that is generous mixed with it; but a higher culture teaches people that the good of the community, not of some particular clique, is the right thing to aim at, and that truth, at any price, is the best way to secure that.

If, on the other hand, you are not a poor man; if you are rich enough to afford it; or if you have a touch of Don Quixote about you; that is to say, if you are willing to incur risk for the sake of some possible good that may ensue, then, you cannot do better than let the matter come into the law courts.

* The "castes" of Hindostan are the strongest manifestations I know of this principle. The opposite principle is Christianity. The first says, "all things and all people, with the exception of a select few, are unclean." The latter says, "nothing is unclean of itself." "God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean," &c.

At any rate, the attention of the public will be drawn to the case, and no reform can be accomplished in any matter so long as the public know nothing about it. You may say that you cannot see that it will do any good. But no one knows what will, or what will not, do good. Fight with the devil and all his works. That is a man's business. Which is likely to win? That is not his business. Mr. Stopford Brook says, "the constant ceaseless work of the saints in heaven and earth, is to fight with evil." Even utilitarians themselves tell us that people should do good, because it will give them pleasure.*

Again, if you are a great rogue who has swindled somebody, or been swindled by somebody, out of £100,000, then you may apply to the lawyers without hesitation. They will consider it a very important case, and will go heart and soul into it. But yours is a paltry affair; only about children, life, death, parents' anguish, &c., &c. No doubt we have all read something about suffering "little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," but this was said such a long time ago, and we have learned a thing or two since then.† Indeed, that

* I wonder what the utilitarians would make of the case of the used-up man, who could take pleasure in nothing on earth, and who was recommended to try doing some good to his fellow creatures; O, he said, "do you think I have not tried that dodge? Of course I have, and it did not give me any pleasure at all."

† As we read in the Biglow papers,

"For J. P.

Robinson, he

says, they did not know everything down in Judee."

illustrious man, Mr. Malthus, tells us almost in so many words, that there are always too many children in the world.

Besides, in those early times, nothing was known about the new beatitudes of the nineteenth century "blessed are the rich for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," and "blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after money for their pockets shall be filled."

I am not complaining of the spirit of the age. The spirit of the age. Everybody should perhaps belong to the era in which he lives. Very likely the progress of the human race is best accomplished by each particular age being devoted to the cultivation of some one quality. It would be idle for a plesiosaurus to be dissatisfied with its era, and aim at acquiring the habits and customs of the higher animals. Any such vain strivings could only lead to the creature's discomfiture. Now this may be the era for the cultivation of worldly prudence; a very valuable and even necessary part of human nature.

No doubt, according to one philosophy, improvement only comes from striving for it. Crawling things acquire legs from trying to walk; wings from trying to fly; and in men, advancement above the condition of Makalolos and Choctaws, from striving and aspiring after higher things. But this is not the place to discuss such matters.

Again, I tell you, that if you appeal to the law you *may* do some good, and you *must* lose some money. But you should remember that, in former days, in a similar case of opposing popular opinion,

you would have not only lost your money but your life as well. Even now, in one country which plumes itself on its liberty, an opposer of public opinion runs the risk of being tarred and feathered.*

Yours is, I grant, a very hard case. Your children are murdered according to the law, and you have no redress.

Why misery
of innocent
people al-
lowed.

Why evil, misery, and cruel suffering are allowed to befall innocent people is, of course, a very hard puzzle, that has perplexed the minds of men in all ages.

Reynold tells us, that in the middle ages, in Germany and Italy, such numbers of people were seduced to sorcery, that the whole earth would have

* As we read in the Biglow papers

. "and then they send all rouu'
to see if there's a feather bed that's borryable in the town."

The feathers being of course wanted, with the addition of some tar, for the benefit of some utterer of unpopular opinions.

I have no wish to sneer at American ideas of liberty. Nothing shows narrow mindedness more than judging other people by oneself, or other countries by one's own. Foolish people often hold up American institutions for imitation or warning, but circumstances are so different in the two countries, that such comparisons are generally childish. The vastness of America is a safety valve that takes the place of laws in a great measure. In that country there is room for everybody, wise and foolish, Mormons, Shakers, philosophers, and rowdies. Birds of a feather flock together without incommoding the community. The Mormons at the salt lake, the Shakers in some favourable spot for shaking, the philosophers at Boston, where they can transcendentalise, with no one to disturb them, and the rowdies in the far west, where they can swear, and gamble, and bully, and murder in peace and quietness.

been overflowed with it and laid waste by the devil, had they not in both countries burnt alive some 30,000 heretics.

Here are 30,000 innocent people killed and tortured for a set of childish superstitions.

Mr. Lecky tells us, that during 1,500 years tens of thousands perished by the most agonizing torments without exciting the faintest compassion; that (to give a few instances) a judge at Nancy boasted that he had put to death 800 witches in sixteen years; that at Toulouse 400 people perished for sorcery at a single execution; that 7000 were burned at Trèves, &c., &c., &c. Cruelty in the middle ages.

And all these things, as I say, were in consequence of the whole world being a prey to most ridiculous and childish superstitions.

There were two rival sects at one time, called the *homooousians* and *homoooisians*.

Mr. Lecky says, "however strongly the *homooousians* and *homoooisians* were opposed to each other, they were both agreed that the advocates of the wrong vowel would be damned everlastingly." And accordingly they of course tortured and burned each other whenever they had an opportunity.

Again, Mr. Lecky says, that what people called Christianity, "has certainly inflicted a greater amount of unmerited suffering than any religion that ever was invented"—and all done in the name of the teacher who said, "by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another."

In reading history, one is really sometimes tempted to believe that the human intelligence cannot rise

above the Irish bull stage. But it can, and will in the long-run. If medicine is still in this stage, other sciences are emerging, and medicine will doubtless follow in due time. But till that time comes, suffering must attend medical superstitions, just as formerly they attended religious superstitions.

Professor de
Morgan.

Professor De Morgan says, "it is curious to see how completely the medical man of the nineteenth century squares with the priest of the sixteenth century. The physicians are now the rear guard of the learned world. Nor will they ever recover their lost position till medicine is free."

He also says, "I have a high respect for the physician in everything but medicine."

To continue my observations addressed to those persons whose children have been killed by Vaccination.

I know well that it is poor comfort to you to tell you that vast numbers of other innocent people have suffered cruel tortures.

Your elder children have been killed by Vaccination. You rightly refuse to allow your younger ones to undergo the operation. You are not rich. You and your family depend for your daily bread upon your daily labour. You are carried off by policemen and consigned to the companionship of felons. Your family has now no means of subsistence. Your goods are seized, your furniture is sold, and your wife and children are sent to the workhouse.

Well ; your case is a very hard, a very cruel one, and altogether sounds like stories we read in the old chronicles of what used to happen in times when cruelty and superstition reigned supreme.

I have given you above some instances of these cruelties, and I am sadly afraid you will only call me one of Job's comfortors. But there is no help for it. There is no solution of the puzzle. The puzzle of the suffering of the innocent in this world. The book of Job itself is the earliest known attempt at solution. But it is none. Old Hebrew and Oriental utilitarian philosophy taught that prosperity is the invariable reward of virtue. The book of Job is the first known protest against utilitarianism. It shows the truth that the innocent do occasionally suffer in this world, and gives no explanation of the fact, but it teaches, at the same time, that there is something higher than mere prosperous happiness, and that something is doing right, trusting in God, hoping against hope unswervingly, and believing in good, in spite of present misery.

CHAPTER XI.

UTILITARIANISM.

“The philosophy of Bacon, and Comte his disciple, lives in the senses so, is fit only for natural science. The results of it applied to the higher matters are materialism in psychology, selfishness in ethics, and atheism in theology.”—THEODORE PARKER.

“The cleverer a man is, the more harm he does, if he has not wisdom to match.”—ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

“Materialism and utilitarianism are generally observed to go together.”—MADAME DE STAEL.

“To be spiritually-minded is life.”—ST. PAUL.

“Common sense, moral perception, and genius, the great discoverers of principles, do not reason. They see the truth, but do not know how they see it. It is the second rate men, most useful in their place, who prove, reason, and explain.”—FATHER NEWMAN.

“The cold in clime are cold in blood.”—BYRON.

“No heart is pure that is not passionate; no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic.”—AUTHOR OF “ECCE HOMO.”

It may be said that utilitarianism has nothing to do with Vaccination. But it has a great deal to do with it. “Utilitarianism,” or “expediency,” or “doing wrong that good may come of it,” or whatever may be the phrase employed, is at the root of all such legislation as that which makes Vaccination compulsory. I, therefore, make no apology for adding the following observations on the subject :

I suppose everybody knows that the utilitarian war cry is, “The greatest happiness to the greatest

numbers," but this is simply meaningless, because "happiness" is utterly undefinable, impalpable, and unmeasurable. Goldsmith's miserable looking cripple and beggar said of himself in self congratulation, "it is not everyone who is born with a silver spoon in his mouth," and Shakespeare's king said that kings are miserable men. What does happiness mean? St. Paul says, "happiness (joy is the word he uses) means that state of mind which results from the spirit of holiness and goodness." So, perhaps, the Jeremy Benthamites mean the greatest holiness to the greatest numbers. But, then, the Esquimaux, who were brought to Paris by Prince Napoleon, and indulged with every pleasure Paris could afford, fell on their knees before the Prince, and prayed for a darkened room and plenty of blubber, and then they would be perfectly happy. So, perhaps, the Jeremy Benthamites mean the greatest quantity of blubber to the greatest numbers. Socrates said, that "happiness" meant that state of mind which resulted from self-control, self-denial, and asceticism. Pope said happiness meant "virtue." The navy said, "drinking beer with a fiddle going." The Pythagoreans said happiness meant "silence and contemplation;" the Hindoo Yogi says, "standing on one leg, staring at the sun, and eating putrid meat;" the old judge said, "sitting in a court of justice all day, and playing whist all night;" the nice old woman said, "knitting worsted stockings with a clean apron on." That very pleasant writer, Mr. Helps, says, "the feeling of reverence affords the

What does
happiness
mean.

most exquisite felicity of which men are capable." Not to give more instances, again I ask, do the utilitarians mean virtue, or self-denial, or holiness, or whist, or silence, or clean aprons, or reverence, or beer, or blubber, or what? Because, if they cannot define the chief corner-stone on which their system is founded, the building must fall to the ground.

The second corner-stone is "utility;" but this merely means that which conduces to happiness; so if happiness cannot be defined, neither can utility.

The third corner-stone is, "denial of hereditary moral sense." Now, the hereditary principle has been so extensively investigated by Darwin and others, that the whole question has become changed. Herbert Spencer's doctrine, in consequence of these new lights, is somewhat to the following effect, as I understand it. Millions of years ago, the savage of the period, whenever he stole his chief's arrow heads, or wife, or other chattel, was always impaled at once. After this had gone on for a few thousand years, it at last began to dawn on the savage intelligence, that there was a connection between these two circumstances, and in a very few more, the fact became established amongst them, that when the first was discontinued, the latter ceased to follow. The more intelligent savages, who acted upon this discovery, surviving by natural selection (or survival of the fittest, as Mr. Spencer calls it), handed down to their children a slight hereditary tendency to escape impalement, by abstaining from stealing. This was the origin of the moral sense in man.

Hereditary
tendencies.

Gradually increasing in intensity during the succeeding ages, the feeling has at last acquired such strength, that the sense of right and wrong is now almost the sole rule of conduct to great numbers of people, and those to whom it is not a rule of conduct, are very apt to find themselves hanged. Of course, H. Spencer does not put it in this form. He lives high up in the serene skies of abstract ideas.* One cannot expect a philosopher, who defines "life" to be "the definite combination of heterogeneous changes in correspondence with external co-existences and sequences," and who defines "création" to be the change from indefinite homogeneity to definite heterogeneity,—I say one cannot expect such a man to descend to popular exposition. It would be unreasonable to do so.

What I have described is, whether right or wrong, the philosophy of the day. Knowledge upon such subjects must be for ever infinitely inadequate ; but, at any rate, the theory accounts for an innate conscience, and innate feelings, tendencies, and capacities of mind to any amount whatever, all which utilitarianism denies.

After all, why should we make such a fuss about Darwinism? The only question that signifies two straws is what a man is now—is he a good one or a bad one. Yet he troubles his head little enough

* Few can put a thing in a popular way so well as Mr. Spencer, when he does descend from the "serene skies." Every Member of Parliament and professional politician who can read, should study his contributions to the *Contemporary Review*. They are admirable.

about this, but makes himself unhappy, because he is told that his ancestor was a polypus in the time of chaos. Now and then we meet with angelic men and women walking on this earth. Surely it is wonderful and admirable to think that they have risen to such a height above their ancestor. Sometimes we meet with diabolic men. Surely it is wonderful and dreadful to think that they have fallen to such a depth below their ancestor.

The fourth corner-stone is, denial of disinterested, unconscious unselfishness in man. This stone is getting into a sad crumbling state, but it will never perhaps be completely destroyed, for it would be necessary to destroy first, all those who by birth, habits of abstract thinking, or other causes, are incapable of understanding the meaning of disinterested unselfishness ; people who are to the higher things of human nature what the colour-blind man is to colour. I am afraid there are a good many such in our part of the world, "the cold in clime are cold in blood," says Byron.

Some Benthamites seeing the precarious condition of their corner-stone, and the dilapidated state of the old structure, are crawling out by the back way, and quite right too. If I were in such a tumble-down building, I would get out of it any way I could. They stick to utilitarianism in name, but shuffle out of its distinctive doctrines one by one. Some try propping. One prop is, denial of free will ; but it is little suited to the purpose, though, were it otherwise, it would be serviceable enough, for, connected as it is with the insoluble

mysteries, it will never be completely destroyed, certainly not by reasoning, for that only makes matters worse. He who uses nothing but his reason, must logically end in the denial of everything, like Mr. Mill, who denies the existence of both mind and matter;* or like Hegel, who eliminates from the Deity all attributes but knowing

* Mr. Mill says, there is nothing in the world but sensations and groups of sensations; that "snow," for instance, does not mean anything external to a man's self, but is only the group of sensations expressed by the words, "whiteness," "softness," "coldness," "sparkle," &c. This is one of the two great branches of his philosophy. The other is, that a man is an automaton, without free will, put into motion, and kept going solely by the influence of external circumstances, in a world external to himself. To put these two branches of Mr. Mill's philosophy concisely, every man is composed solely of sensations created by a world external to himself, which world does not exist. This is the absurd contradiction into which one of the clearest-headed men who ever lived has been led, by his refusal, to acknowledge that men in this world can only see "as through a glass darkly," and that life hangs entirely upon faith in things that cannot be proved to the understanding.

People who believe in man's power to define, explain, and comprehend everything, must contradict themselves at every step, like those who assert that men cannot know anything about God, and by that very assertion, assert that they do know something about him, namely, that he cannot make himself known to any of his creatures.

The human mind is fitted for its business in this world, but not for perfect knowledge beyond that. To see otherwise than "as through a glass darkly,"—to know absolutely about the great mysteries would be more than it could bear. To know the full meaning of life (so called), and death (so called), and spirit (so called), and matter (so called), and divinity (so called), and eternity (so called), and time (so called), would drive the knower mad, even supposing it possible.

and loving, and to the question what knows and loves answers, "the infinite nothing."

A man is an organ with a good many thousand stops. Pull out the logic stop and the note may be a very clear one perhaps, but as a manifestation of human nature it will be ludicrously false and inadequate.

Scientific
ideas of the
period.

The comteist, materialistic, and atheistic scientific men of the day say, that it is superstitious and unscientific to believe in anything only from faith, and which cannot be proved to the understanding. It is a very curious illustration of the peculiarities of the typical scientific intelligence that these very men are unable to see that they cannot make even one step in their own sciences without believing in things the existence of which, as Mr. Mill very truly says, cannot be proved to the understanding, such as colour, scents, sounds, form, extension, hardness, motion, forces, &c., &c. It cannot be proved to the understanding that these things, as we call them, are anything else than forms of our sensations. And yet all scientific men believe in them. That is to say, (according to their own definitions of what is superstitious and unscientific,) all scientific men are superstitious and unscientific. Of course, they are right to believe in them ; because faith founded on our necessary instinctive feelings compels us to believe in them in spite of their not being demonstrable to the understanding. Just so faith founded on our necessary instinctive feelings compels us to believe (in spite of their not being demonstrable to the understanding,) in God, duty, right, wrong, free

will, &c., &c.* Mr. Mill, no doubt is consistent, and courageously disbelieves in the existence of everything and everybody, mind, matter, and every earthly or heavenly thing except his own sensations; but this power is not given to most people.

Mr. Mill denies that proof is possible in anything, for who is to prove the axioms on which all demonstration must be founded? And, in fact, he does deny them. He says, Euclid is all wrong in saying a point has no magnitude, that a line *has* breadth as well as length, and that 2 and 2 although most people think they Mr. Mill. make 4 in our little planet, may for all he knows, make twenty elsewhere, or even a hundred. He also as I say, denies that there can be any proof of

* Disbelief in free will, and disbelief in God, seem to go together. Sir William Hamilton says, "that fatalism, and atheism are convertible terms."

Dugald Stewart says, "it will not be denied that, in the history of modern philosophy, the schemes of atheism and necessity, have been hitherto always connected together; not that I would say it must be so, but only, that every modern atheist I have heard of has been a necessitarian." There are exceptional varieties, but, as a rule, atheism, materialism, utilitarianism, cold reasoning, necessitarianism, are all, more or less, observed to go together. The relative proportion in the ingredients of the mind, that leads to one of these things, as a rule, leads to the other also; or, to put it another way, they are the negative manifestations that show themselves when certain positive qualities are absent; qualities, for instance, such as joyousness, faith, hope, heartiness, &c., &c. Most men will have observed of themselves that, when they are at their best, that is, in their highest state of health and vitality, these Christian states of mind have most prevailed; also, that when their vitality has been low, they have been changed for doubt, hopelessness, depression, and deficiency in sympathizing power.

either mind or matter. Following Hume, Berkeley, and others, he says, that although A may talk to B or knock his head against a wall, he cannot possibly know that either B or the wall exist: all he can know is that he has certain sensations which he calls sight, hearing, touch, &c. So far, he is right. But his conclusion therefrom is fearfully and wonderfully wrong. His conclusion is, that it is foolish and superstitious for A to believe in anything else but these sensations of his; whereas, the true conclusion is, that we live by faith and not by knowledge, and that we ought humbly to acknowledge the limited reach of human intelligence. If a thing cannot be proved he denies its existence. His is what Gœthe calls "the spirit which always denies," carried to the utmost possible extreme. His philosophy is absence of faith carried as far as it can be carried, for it is impossible for a man to doubt that he has sensations. Mr. Mill himself cannot do that. His philosophy is the critical and destructive spirit carried to the utmost.

Now, so true is it that we do "live by faith," and not by knowledge, that if it were possible for a man really to disbelieve in everything but his own sensations, and to act out this disbelief he would be dead in a week. What keeps a man alive is the unceasing stimulus that comes from interest in what is external to self. Destroy faith in the existence of that, (supposing such a thing possible), and life must cease.*

* Faith in the truth of human nature, and in numberless things which cannot be proved to the understanding, is the most essential

There is much deeper truth than most people see in the words, "if thou eatest (solely) of the fruit of the tree of knowledge thou shalt surely die." Mr. Mills' philosophy is sometimes called nihilism. The world is carried on by division of labour ; so abstract thinkers have their proper place in it. But can they all be called quite living men ? The fruits of the spirit are hope, reverence, what Mr. Gladstone calls that highest form of virtue "holiness," joy, faith, cheerfulness, &c. ; life in fact, to put them all in one word. But long-continued habits of abstract thought notoriously tend to destroy these things, and thus he who has such habits "shall surely die" more or less ; nothing is left of him but reasoning ; that is abstraction ; that is trance ; that is stagnation of blood ; that is death more or less ; and his works will usually be more of the destructive, critical, and

of all the parts of human nature. Without faith there can be little hope, little joy. The writings, therefore, of a man without faith can be good for very little, however ingenious they may be. This throws into the waste paper basket a vast quantity of German philosophy. Hegel rightly condemned Kant for holding that the fact of all men believing a thing to be true, proves it to be false. The first to be thrown into the basket must be the works of Fenerbach, the foundation-stone of his philosophy being that, as it cannot be proved to the understanding that there is any actual objective being answering to a man's idea of God, the idea is nothing but an idea in his own mind. If writing is false, its being clever only makes it so much the greater rubbish. All books, even novels, written by disciples of these philosophers, are generally hopeless melancholy affairs. Mr. Mill's own writings are said, with truth, to breathe throughout joyless discontent and despair of human nature.

negative order, than of the creative and positive order. Still many things want destroying. All foul ignorances and superstitions want sweeping away; so in classifying writers, the analysing and criticising kind are sometimes called "the scavengers." And useful work they do. They are like the fault-finders of every day life, useful in a negative, but not edifying in a positive way. Pullers down, not builders up.

Men are often different from their books, but to judge from his later writings and speeches, Mr. Mill
 Mr. Mill. (when he descends from his transcendentials) seems to come under the head of "Misanthropic Philanthropists." That is to say, he seems to hate the world and all its ways as God has made them, but he dreams philanthropic dreams about the very different manner *he* would have done it. He is like the great philosopher, who taught that hunger was but a clumsy contrivance for the regulation of eating; that the love of parents for their children was one of nature's bumbles; and the feeling that is natural between the sexes a mistake altogether. Mr. Mill seems to believe in the world being regenerated by philosophers, not seeing that, regardless of dreamers, it is always being slowly and surely regenerated, assimilating the good grain and letting all the theoretical chaff blow away. Frederick the great said, "if I wanted to ruin a country I would set the philosophers to govern it." The whining carpers at man, as God has made him to suit each era in which he lives, should remember that among the fruits of the spirit, St. Paul makes no mention whatever of an
 How to ruin
 a country.

irritable craving for detraction, nor of discontent, nor of dyspepsia.* Not that the class, as a rule, care a straw what St. Paul says. But that does not make his words any less words of wisdom.

Communists, socialists, and philosophic radicals coolly talk of regenerating society, as if it were the easiest thing in the world. But a man loves property as a sheep loves grass. Possibly the latter might, after a few thousand generations and careful selection, be regenerated into loathing the sight of grass. So men in time may loath the idea of possessing property.

Communism, in some few cases, arises from a Communism. generous utopianism, combined with a fervid imagination, and ignorance of history and of human nature. But more commonly it arises from enviousness and discontentedness of disposition, combined with the idea, so common amongst vulgar people, that happiness has something to do with riches. This tone of

* There can be no doubt that abstraction of mind, want of vitality, languid circulation of the blood, and defective digestion, are all apt to be connected together. Tissot lays at the door of habitual abstraction of the intellect, and book work, gout, tumours, inflammations, apoplexies, convulsions, &c. In one phrase, want of the spiritual life which keeps the blood going, and the body healthy. The perfection of abstraction seems to have been reached by the mystics of former times. We are told that by earnestly transposing their self consciousness to the pits of their stomachs, they had the power of merging themselves into the absolute divinity, which appeared to them as a pure white light. For some days they lived on bread and water. Sunk into profound silence, they turned their eyes in deep concentration of soul to the point of the nose, and then the white light appeared. I doubt not that this account is substantially true. The white light probably really meant idiotic vacuity of mind.

mind is amusingly illustrated by the story of the whipper-in, when he was asked about his ex-fellow-whip "Jem" who had lately come in for a little money. "Oh," he said, "Jem's as happy as the day
Anecdote. is long. He is livin the life of a hangel—eatin, and drinkin, and cussin, and swearin, and doin nothink."

Author of "Ginx's Baby." The clever author of "Ginx's Baby" has an ingenious theory about the communistic tone of mind. Trying to account for the fact that shoemakers are especially subject to it, he supposes that the cramped position of body they are compelled to adopt for so many hours every day, tends to produce a state of chronic indigestion, and the ill-conditioned and discontented frame of mind which always accompanies that distressing malady. If this theory is true, it throws a flood of light upon the whole phenomenon of communism. Undoubtedly few people consider the inevitable connection that exists between discontent and dyspepsia, as also between content and a high degree of health.

Half-educated people, who seize hold of the letter of some badly translated text that suits their theories, but who are incapable of seeing the general spirit of things, or of understanding the metaphorical and unprecise nature of Oriental language, often say, that Christianity means communism, and it is true that the early Christians thought so and tried to carry it out. The result was of course what it always has been, and always must be in the end. Pauperism, idleness, and wretchedness, and constant appeals "to distribute to the necessity of the saints."

To attempt to define happiness is folly. It is Happiness. different for every born man. But good hints have been given—some even so good, that they have become proverbial. Plato said, that health was the principle requisite. “*Mens sana in corpore sano*” is so wise that it has become a vulgar saying. “My mind to me a kingdom is” says the poet ; also, “*rex est qui metuit nihil et hoc regnum sibi quisque det.*” Christ said, that humble minded, merciful people, who are pure in heart, and who strive after righteousness, are the happiest. Paley said, that occupation was the secret of happiness. Voltaire said, “work.” If this latter be true, and if the common idea is true that rich people have less occupation than others, of course riches will be unfavourable to happiness ; at the same time that the pursuit of riches will produce more happiness than any other one cause, because it produces more occupation.

Many sayings and many instances could be given to show that change from habits of any kind is unfavourable to happiness. Sir B. Brodie tells us of a man who suddenly became rich, and who was so wretched in consequence that he hung himself. “Set a beggar on horse-back and he will ride to the devil.” Men, after being in prison twenty years, have been miserable when they had to leave it. Sudden change from riches to poverty will make people wretched. It would be easy to multiply hints such as these, some of which however refer more to the absence of unhappiness, than to the presence of happiness. To attempt the definition of the more intense forms of happiness, the hearty

joyousness of (not only good but) high health, the bliss of real Godliness, the joy of the musician in harmony, or the poet in beauty, would be as absurd as to try to define the passion of joy that inspires the skylark's song. The song itself is the only possible definition.

I say, the bliss of real Godliness to distinguish it from the fanaticisms. Fanaticism is not Godliness at all. It is only an enthusiasm or hobby of the imagination over which men excite their brains.

St. Francis de Sales says, that he enjoyed paradise on earth, his life was so intensely happy.

The conclusion of a writer in the *Quarterly Review* is to the effect, that Mr. Mill, as a man, is quite a different thing from Mr. Mill, as a writer and philosopher. I doubt not that this is so. But what the public has to do with, is his system of philosophy, as contained in his writings.

Hereditary
Benthamism.

The fact is, Mr. Mill had the misfortune to be born with Benthamism in his blood. Utilitarianism was the family philosophy. Just as a young pointer, immediately a partridge for the first time is presented to his notice, stands with his tail stretched out in a straight line, for a quarter of an hour, in opposition to the instincts of his pregenitors, before the trick was taught them; so a man, born and bred to utilitarianism, immediately a question in moral philosophy is for the first time presented to his notice, propounds a utilitarian solution of it, in direct opposition to the whole human race. By the misfortune of his birth, Mr. Mill is a great loss to mankind, for his mental powers are very great. But

if the key note of a man's philosophy is false, the whole will be false. Because necessitarianism is a terribly pernicious error, that is no reason for going into the opposite extreme, and ignoring circumstances over which one has no control. Of course, all the free will in the world will not enable a man, "by taking thought, to add one cubit unto his stature." Luther said, the human mind was like a drunken man on horseback. Prop him up on one side, and he tumbles off the other.

Mr. Lecky says, "utility is the highest motive reason can reach. The sacrifice of enjoyment, and endurance of suffering, becomes rational only when some compensating advantage can be expected. The conduct of the Turk, who believing death to be an eternal sleep, refused at the stake to make a recantation of doctrines he had taught, replying to every remonstrance, "although there is no recompense to be looked for, yet, the love of truth constraineth me to die in its defence," is in the eye of reason, an inexplicable folly; and, it is only by appealing to a far higher faculty, that it appears in its true light, as one of the loftiest of virtues. It is from the moral or religious faculty alone that we can obtain the conception of the purely disinterested. This is indeed the noblest thing we possess—the celestial spark that is within us—the impress of the divine image—the principle of every heroism."

Mr. Lecky.

Utilitarian-
ism.

A word about free will.

Free will.

Herbert Spencer's definition of life denies free will. "Life," he says, "is a continual adjustment of internal relations to external co-existencies and

sequences ;" or, as he puts it elsewhere, "the harmonious adjustment between the organism and its environment. Denying free will, he says, "if men had it, this beneficial adjustment would be disturbed." But it is disturbed every day, and people suffer every day in consequence of this disturbance, caused by their free will. A school boy exercises his free will, and plays at cricket, instead of learning his lesson. Next morning, at the usual time for the performance of the ceremony, he is flogged. In this case, the

Mr. Spencer. flogging is, to use Mr. Spencer's phraseology, "the external sequence." But surely it must be looked upon as a disturbance, to a certain degree, of the harmonious correspondence between the organism and its environment. And yet, Mr. Spencer denies that this disturbance ever takes place.

The fact is, his definition of life is only a definition of some few manifestations of life, which the coarse senses and intelligence of men are capable of observing. Life remains the same mystery as ever. "*Omne vivum ex ovo*," is an axiom still believed in by many. Now, all eggs are, as far as analysis can go, made up of the same ingredients. Then why does one turn into a bird of paradise, and another into an ornithorincus paradoxus? I think there is a little mystery here, that the analysts and protoplasmists have not yet quite succeeded in penetrating.

Of course, logic by itself, lands us in denial of free will. So much the worse then for logic. In this, as in so many other things, the highest wisdom consists in believing in what the understandings of men are incapable of explaining.

The great effort of men of science of the present day, who devote their exclusive attention to the material side of nature,* seems to be, to prove the uncertainty of God's existence, the absurdity of prayer, and the non-existence of free will.

If these doctrines of theirs are true, the sooner we set to work to alter all the habits and language of human life the better. Take, for instance, the Lord's prayer, which is so often used. I understand, from Dr. Maudesley's book, that emotional phenom-
Godless
philosophy.

* Sir W. Hamilton says, that one objection to the exclusive cultivation of the physical sciences is, that those who do cultivate them exclusively, lose their faculties of wonder, admiration, reverence, worship, &c. Mr. J. Mills' answer to this is, "that is not true, because the physical sciences are about such wonderful things, that they ought rather to cultivate these faculties." I suppose, if anyone said Fauntleroy, the forger, was a rascal, Mr. Mill would say, "he was not a rascal, because he ought to have been an honest man." Of course, Sir W. Hamilton was talking of what is observed to be the case as men are made, not as it is imagined, by the brain of an ingenious theorist, he ought to be made.

Many clever men do great service to mankind by devoting their lives to the physical sciences. Some of them are unqualified for higher things, and therefore deny that anything is higher.

But what says the vox populi? Which is valued most, the man of science, or the moral and religious teacher (by his life as well as doctrines)? Why, in the estimation of mankind, the highest moral and religious teacher is to the highest (say) astronomer, as the latter is to a cockroach. And yet, the astronomer is enormously valued. But the former is worshipped; even a Comte finds worshippers. "Vox populi, vox Dei." Again, "Il-y-a quelqu' un qui est plus sage que Socrate que Bacon que Platon—c'est tout le monde." Men value physical facts most highly, but their real craving is for something very different. Men have been worshipped, and are worshipped, but not for mere gymnastic feats of intellect, however wonderful.

ena really means lactic acid, secreted by the emotional nerves, and the medulla oblongata, through chemical action. The Lord's prayer must therefore be altered to suit this advanced state of our knowledge. The commencement of it must be changed to a mere statement of an observed fact. Instead of "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name," we must in future say, "Our Father (if thou existed) which are in heaven, (if there be a heaven) we observe that lactic acid is being secreted from our medulla oblongata." All the rest must be omitted, because it consists entirely of prayers. For an automaton, without free will, to pray to a God, whose existence is an unsettled question, to alter what is unalterable, is, of course, an absurdity.

This, then, is what every mother is to teach her child ; also, that it must follow its strongest instincts, because it has no alternative ; that choosing to do right instead of wrong, is a phrase without meaning ; that if it tells lies, it does so necessarily, from the natural conformation of its brain ; and that prayer,*

* A few years ago, in a pamphlet I wrote about the cattle plague, I made the following observations about prayer.

"Professor Tyndal writes to show the impossibility of nature's laws being influenced by prayer. Views of this kind seem natural to those who devote their whole lives to material science, or to what is called, the dead side of nature. But there is a spiritual, or what is called, the living side of nature, and people, whose thoughts tend rather to this side, are more impressed with what men do not know with their understandings, than with what they think they do know ;—with the utter mystery that is in all things, than with the so-called comprehended laws of the universe ;—with the endless novelty that there is in creation, than with the supposed

being illogical, must never be used. A mother must teach her child either this, or the opposite to this.

I suppose, our philosophers will hardly say that, though false, the latter must be taught in childhood ; for this would be saying, that children should be brought up in a system of deceit, dishonesty, and lies ; necessarily resulting in a life of deceit, dishonesty, and lies. Now men of science will, I repeat, hardly say this, for whatever may be thought of their powers of mind, when they get beyond their own subjects, they are generally excellent men, as

“ invariableness of routine in nature ;—with the freedom of mind, than with the necessities of matter.” Sir William Hamilton says, “ the highest knowledge is consciousness of our ignorance.” Socrates says much the same thing. Charles Lamb says, “ Ignorance we all know the meaning of only too well. Knowledge is nothing but the same thing systematised.” St. Paul says, “ All (human) knowledge shall pass away.”

Now about the prayer we are hearing every Sunday for deliverance from the cattle plague. Perhaps it rather too much reminds one of the Arab, when the plague visits his village. He prays says the traveller, not that the plague may cease, but that it may depart to another village. So we are praying, not that the pestilence may cease, but that it may be kept far away from our shores. Still prayer cannot but be right. Anything that makes men acknowledge that all good things come from God, and that all punishments for wickedness and folly come also from his hand, cannot but be right. And, in the present case, if my views have truth, that this cattle plague is caused by man's ignorance, idleness, stupidity, and cruelty, just as pestilences amongst men are caused by his ignorance, stupidity, dirt, indolence, and intemperance, any prayers for God's Spirit to raise him from such a state. and thus save him from the consequences of it, cannot but be right, and in the eye of a Christian must, if sincere, be efficacious.”

far as in them lies, and often living illustrations of the falseness of their own creed. Besides, these very men tell us, that everything is to be settled by experiment, and induction. Now, in real life, it is found by experience, that those who are brought up in these Godless principles, actually do turn out scoundrels, more or less; negative scoundrels, perhaps if untempted, but positive, if tempted.

To give another illustration.

Hitherto, a Judge has sentenced a murderer, in what may be epitomized into the following sentences. "Prisoner at the bar, you have been convicted of committing a cruel murder. Men who will not restrain their violent passions must be punished. It is therefore my painful duty to order that you be hanged by the neck until you be dead, and may the Lord have mercy upon your soul."

Now, if the necessitarians are right; and if the utilitarians are right in saying, that if ever a man does his duty, it is only because it gives him more pleasure to do it than not to do it—I repeat, if these teachers are right, the Judge in future will have to say, "Prisoner, at the bar, you have been convicted of committing a cruel murder. Although you were compelled to commit this murder by your organization, society must protect itself, by destroying those who are born with this unfortunate organization. I therefore have great pleasure in ordering that you be hanged by the neck until you be dead, and may the Lord (if there be a Lord) save your soul (if you have a soul)."

This is merely another instance to show how language, in all human affairs, will have to be altered, if the necessitarians are right. For if it were not altered, we should all live, and breathe, and have our being in a world of lies. It is high time that mealy-mouthed "sweetness and light" in these matters, should come to an end. Whether men have, or have not, free will, is a question of vital importance to every born human being. If a doctrine is true, language ought to be in accordance with it. Life is a reality. What mankind craves from its wise men is to be taught how to act, and how to speak, not how to juggle with notions. If the wise men cannot teach them this, they are not wise men.

Again, I ask, what do our philosophers really mean? Is the English language to be altered? Are the terms "will," "choice," "responsibility," "virtue," "duty," "spiritual," "originality," "God," "divine," "holy," "disinterested," and innumerable others to be banished from language?

Do they tell mankind that the mother should teach her child, and the judge should address the murderer in the manner I have described, or do do they not? If the former, we shall know clearly what they mean. If the latter, they give up their whole position, and confess, as if in so many words, that their theories are mere webs spun out of the half lifeless brains of dreamers, when in a state of abstraction, trance, or coma.

Men of science have generally clear enough heads, but they sometimes say strangely illogical things, when they get away from their own matters. For

instance, Dr. H. Maudesley, like most men of science, says, that it is unphilosophical to attribute attributes to a deity; and yet, in the very next page, he, himself, attributes to Him intelligence. Dr. Maudesley's own prevailing faculty is intelligence. The low savage, whose prevailing faculty is terror of some incomprehensible disasters, looks upon God as a fearful demon. The North American Indian, a mere hunting creature, looks upon Him as the great hunter of the happy hunting grounds. The ball-going fine lady of eighty years ago said, her idea of God was as of a supreme master of ceremonies. Hegel, a piece of reasoning machinery, says, God means "pure reason."

It is like the ideas people have of heaven. A Mahometan polygamist thinks it means an unlimited supply of wives. Sidney Smith, who was fond of a good dinner said, he looked upon it as a place where people eat foie gras to the sound of trumpets. An astronomer, no doubt, thinks it a place where everybody will know why one star is yellow and another blue; whether the sun is really hot or not, &c. Swedenborg was rather mad, and thought he passed a good deal of his time in heaven; so he believed there was no difference between heaven and this life. A contemplative philosopher thinks, heaven means a place of peaceful contemplation. All this is as it must be, for no one can think what he has not got in him to think. But whatever the form, they all believe in the reality, except some few people, like the Comteist, who have exceptional minds. It would be a difficult thing to show that

these strange persons are not slightly insane, for an insane man means, a man the character of whose mind is exceptional, and, as far as knowledge has yet got, it means nothing else ; that is, no other definition of it can be given. Comte, himself, was not quite a sane man. He passed a certain portion of his life in lunatic asylums, and his abnormal self-conceit alone amounted to insanity. Lunatic asylums are full of people who think themselves saviours of the world. Self-consciousness, self-contemplation, and self-conceit gone mad. Goethe calls self-consciousness, conceit, vanity, &c., the negative manifestations of human nature, in opposition to the Christian graces of unconscious joy, life, hope, faith, reverence, &c., which are the positive manifestations.

But whatever may have been the fanciful views, such as I have described the attitude of the mass of mankind above the condition of savages, towards God is, and always has been, in different degrees, that of worship and adoration of His goodness and awe at His power. The attitude of the scientific man of the period towards Him is puzzleheadedness over His inscrutability.

Professor De Morgan says, "the denial of a ruling power was not in the plan of the higher philosophers ; it was left for the smaller fry.

Minds of the scientific type can only do what they have got in them to do. The ideal extreme of the thing would be according to Mr. James Martineau, Mr. J. Martineau. "a mind reduced to an unmoral impersonal mechanism of intellectual elaboration." Such a being

would, of course, be a horrible monster, but the discoveries in physical science that it would make (if it lived) might perhaps be marvellous.

Animals crave food to eat ; a sure indication that there is food for animals to eat.

Men crave a God to worship ; a sure indication that there is a God for men to worship.

Sick animals do not crave food, but that does not affect the rule.

Exceptional philosophers do not crave a God to worship, but neither does that fact affect the rule.

Philosophers sometimes do extremely useful, analyzing, and critical work ; but they are generally more or less strange beings, who live in a state of trance ; who isolate themselves from their kind ; who seldom laugh and never weep ; who are dead to the interests, amusements, and occupations of their fellow-creatures ; who rejoice not with those that rejoice, and mourn not with those that mourn ; whose blood is torpid, flesh flabby, complexion colourless, stomachs deranged, and muscles of the consistency of batter pudding.

Many of these passionless creatures undoubtedly do not want a God to worship, for they have nothing to worship him with if they had one. But, as I say, they are exceptional.

German

Philosophers.

Philosophy comes mostly from Germany. It is related of German professors, that they will sometimes sit in their studies for days together, absorbed in thought, books, and tobacco smoke, without speaking to a soul.

In touching upon Utilitarianism, it is impossible to avoid altogether Atheism, Materialism (or the tendency to look solely at what is called the dead side of nature,) and Necessitarianism, for they can hardly be separated. They dovetail into each other, and are almost always observed to go together. Utilitarianism, Materialism, and Necessitarianism may be looked upon as three marauders, unceasingly running down and striving to hunt to the death all the higher and religious elements that exist in the hearts of men. They are perfectly honest, and are proud of their calling, which they think the highest one in the world, but they generally take with them a cur dog called Atheism, and of him they are rather ashamed. Indeed he is, in the estimation of most people, such an ill-favoured beast, that this is not to be wondered at. To be sure they clean him up, give him a fine name, crop his ears, dock his tail, and put a smart collar round his neck, with "Inscrutability" inscribed upon it; still they hardly like to be seen with him, and they hold him in with a string as much as they can, but sometimes the brute gets loose in spite of them.

The strange beings who call themselves philosophers seem to think that life means knowledge; that the object of life is to know. But what in the world has knowledge of the ingredients and origin of a thing to do with the thing itself? Wine is said to gladden the heart of man. That, then, is the real meaning of wine, not knowledge of what it had been before it was wine. A man with his soul made in the image of God is the real thing. The

Knowledge.

earths his body is made of, the knowledge that his body is made of them ; what he had been before he was a man, and the knowledge of what he had been before he was a man—all these things by themselves are nothing. The music is the real thing. The catgut that produces it, and the knowledge that the catgut produces it are nothing. Worship, hope, and delight are the real things. The lactic acid evolved out of the medulla oblongata, to which they say these things can be traced, is nothing. The bliss imparted to a gourmand by turtle is the real thing in the matter. Knowledge of the chemical analysis of green fat is less than nothing for just by so much as he thinks about it is his bliss diminished.

The illusion (so called) or the effect produced on the mind by the beautiful and spirit stirring scenes on the stage of a theatre is the real thing. The tinsel and knowledge of the tinsel used to produce it is nothing. Illusion (so called) is life and reality. It is illusion (so called) that sets the blood coursing and the heart beating. Knowledge of the anatomy of the causes of the illusion is, by itself, death and nothingness.

In Dicken's novel, Ralf Nickleby, the usurer cannot help for a moment being touched by the beauty of his niece Kate. But he recovers himself at once and says, "bah ! What is beauty ? There is a grinning skull beneath it." It was a true touch of nature putting this speech into the mouth of a material minded selfish heartless soulless scoundrel.

To be spiritually minded is life.

To be only materially, critically, and analytically minded is death.

Men love. But who would love that was only conscious of the bones, earths, gristle, gases, acids, and alkalies, that composed the body of the beloved one.

Men worship God. But who that only analyzed the material ingredients of the works of God would worship him? Experience shows us that such men, as a rule, do not worship God.

Analyzation and knowledge of the antecedent condition of things we see is by itself nothing. It is burrowing and grovelling amongst dead matter instead of rejoicing in the realities of life; that is instead of living.

Analysis or knowledge of ingredients is useful to science, and therefore should be prosecuted; but it is nothing.

Food is necessary for the body, for it makes the living flesh and blood, but by itself it is mere dead matter—that is nothing. Knowledge is necessary for the soul, but by itself it is only a collection of mere dead facts—that is nothing.

The fruit of the tree of life is man's food. But the Utilitarian-materialist philosophers snatch it out of his mouth, and give him nothing in its place but the fruit of the tree of knowledge, which, by itself, is simply death—spiritual death. The old allegory about these two fruits was written a long time ago, and men think they have advanced since then; and yet I cannot see that they write much wiser things. Goethe's *Faust*, is no doubt wise, but it is only the same allegory dramatized.

And after all, what is knowledge as it is called? It is "seeing as through a glass darkly." The doubting Atheist and the believing Christian often

Doubt. agree there, for "faith" and "doubt" equally imply the absence of certainty. The difference is this: Faith is a manifestation of spiritual life. It is fruitful, and leads to joy, hope, and action. Doubt is a manifestation of spiritual death. It is unfruitful, and leads to hopelessness and inaction. **Faith.** Faith is healthy, and says "perfect knowledge is impossible, but we can live, and believe, and act, and hope, and rejoice, in spite of its being so." Doubt is morbid, and says "perfect knowledge is impossible, so to do is folly, for we know not what we do; to believe is illogical; to hope is delusion; life is objectless, for the object cannot be demonstrated; and so there is nothing left for a wise man to do but to hang himself;" and thousands do hang themselves accordingly. Most people, however, do not hang themselves, for, in most people, faith and hope preponderate over doubt and hopelessness.

The Utilitarian—Necessitarian—Materialists, by denying that such words as "God," "cause," "will," "choice," "duty," "disinterested," "spiritual," "divine," "unselfish," &c., have any meaning, do, in fact, declare by saying so, that they ought to be removed from the language of men. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that they have the whole human race against them in this opinion. The South Australian savages, the Andaman Indians, and the natives of Terra del Fuego, are all on their side. Some of the African negroes and the higher

racés of savages, as we learn from Dr. Livingstone, do possess most of these words, and, therefore, the knowledge and ideas they express. Apes, of course, are without them. I would not mention Apes, only the gentlemen of whom I am speaking state that they are descended from them.

Extremes meet, says the saying.

That illustrious metaphysician Hegel says, that ^{Hegel.} nothing and something are the same, that is, nothing ; and that the visible universe is this nothing gradually becoming—not something, for something is nothing but an approximation to what would be something if it were not nothing.

Men who profess to solve the insoluble, must not expect to escape ridicule, whatever genius they may possess.

Necessitarians say, that all opinions arise necessarily from the natural conformation of the mind that forms them. Then what reason have they for saying that the natural conformation of their minds is the right one, and that of nearly the whole human race wrong ? Exceptional conformation of body is called deformity.

As to Atheism, whether the existence of God be denied or merely ignored, it is practically the same thing, both being non-human, monstrous, and contrary to the nature of men. For a man or a woman to profess Atheism is, to men as they are made, disgusting and repulsive. Belief in a God is engraved in his nature, in his mind, and in his language. He can hardly open his lips without implying it. At a socialist meeting in London, an ^{Atheism.}

orator got up and commenced his oration with the words "Gentlemen," "I am an Atheist, thank God." The meeting was not a very select one, as may be imagined, but the absurdity and offensiveness of this commencement immediately struck every one as so complete, that the wretched orator was hooted out of the room forthwith. No doubt Mr. Mill, whilst he allows it to be a fact, thinks it very shocking that this odium should pursue the professor of Atheism. He seems to think that in this respect men have been made badly. Of course, Mr. Mill may be right. He may be right, and the Creator may be wrong.

About faith, it must be remembered that we can only see "as through a glass darkly." But some see less darkly than others. All depends on the being created. One belief is right for a man, another for a pig, and another for an archangel. One for a saint, and another for a utilitarian. Each of these thinks his own faith the right one. And so it is in one sense. It is not given to everybody to be a saint.

A man is an organ with many stops. One of these being a comparatively insignificant, but still, in its place, highly useful one, called the logic stop. Now in the matter of free will, prayer, &c., perhaps it would be better (even if there were nothing else to go by) to believe in the proof of the pudding, as demonstrated by results in practical life, rather than in the ratiocinations of notion-mongers playing on their one little stop, after having killed all the higher parts of their natures.

The author of "Ecce Homo" says, "perpetual and absorbing mental activity blunts those feelings in which the life of virtue resides;" and again he says, "faith is the germ of all that is good in human character."

In everything but the merest physical matters belief means, the creed resulting from the action of all a man's qualities. Every modification of the qualities modifies the creed. Increase conceit, and the creed will be changed one way; add logic, it will be changed another way; add reverence, another; and so on. His creed will be highest whose soul is the best in quality, quantity, and balance.*

Heine says, that the deepest truth can only come from the deepest love and the deepest passion.

Utilitarians think, that the deepest truth can only come from the sharpest logical ingenuity.

* In practical life, what people call their opinions, generally arise from their tastes, inclinations, and habits of life. A popular orator loves salmon fishing, but not other sports; so he condemns other sports. A great lexicographer, who only loves Fleet Street, defines fishing to be "a stick and a string with a bait at one end and a fool at the other." Some book-writing man cannot ride, so he condemns fox hunting. Some fox hunting farmer cannot read, so he condemns book-writing. Country people call town people effeminate cockneys. Town people do not think much of country people. One class has little knowledge of another class, and therefore has a poor opinion of it. The foundation of antipathy is ignorance, of sympathy knowledge. Great liberality of mind, combined with charity and great imagination, will sometimes take the place of actual knowledge. But it is not everyone who has great liberality of mind combined with charity and great imagination.

It requires a very favourable combination of circumstances to turn out a first-rate article of any kind. In the matter of men, C. Kingsley and F. Maurice seem to think warmth of climate one of the necessary conditions—that the necessary warmth and passion of disposition is hardly to be expected in the cold latitudes. “The cold in clime are cold in blood” says Byron.

I can imagine some person, if he is very foolish, saying, that this is necessitarianism ; but it is not. Men, (to say nothing else,) by their free will, can alter their faculties to an indefinite degree, and thus gain a higher faith. This cannot be proved logically, and yet it is true ; logic in such matters, by itself, is simply a fool.

But, perhaps, belief even in mere physical matters may have something to do with the action of all a man's qualities. At any rate, as we have seen, Hobbes thought that if the pecuniary interests of men were universally and invariably on that side, they would believe, unhesitatingly, that 2 stones added to 2 stones make 5 stones. Mr. Mill sees no reason why, in other worlds, 2 and 2 should not make 5 ; and Mr. H. Spencer says, that men's opinions depend on their desires and moral qualities, not upon their intellects. The majority of people may not agree with Hobbes, but the majority of those who have studied human nature much perhaps will. If, instead of pecuniary interest, Hobbes had supposed the interest to be a still greater one, as, for instance, that of life and of death, of course he would be right, for, in that case,

the believers in 2 and 2 making 5 would be the sole survivors, and the creed would become universal by the process of natural selection, or survival of the fittest.

A few dreaming philosophers tell us, that man has no free will ; that is, that he is no more responsible for his actions than a lunatic, a chimpanzee, or a jelly fish. Common sense, universal experience, Free will. the legislation of all countries, inspiration—that is, the words spoken by men who are acknowledged to have been gifted with a higher spiritual insight arising from more godliness of character than the mass of mankind—all these, say the dreaming philosophers are wrong.

It is certain that many people cannot understand such words as godliness, holiness, &c., of course, therefore, they do not believe in such things. It is to be feared that many poor creatures with stunted souls cannot understand even such words as gratitude, generosity, duty, reverence, &c. Of course, such people do not believe in such things. There can be little doubt that a pig has no music in his soul. Of course, therefore, he does not believe in such a thing as harmony. I have read of an abstracted philosopher who had no will. He had not even will enough to enable him to walk in a straight line. He oscillated from one side of a gravel walk to the other as if he were drunk. Of course, such a man cannot believe in free will. A philosopher, who passes his life in a trance, never does wrong and never does right. One cannot be surprised if he does not believe in conscience. It never comes into play.

Words are thrown away in all such cases. No demonstration can make a blind man see. No man can believe what he has not got in him to believe.* I, myself, am absolutely certain that I have free will, and so I believe in free will in the teeth of my own shallow reasoning, which seems to me to prove the impossibility of my having it. If I had toothache, I should believe in having it in the teeth of even absolutely irrefragable demonstration. When I think I see a hay stack, I know it just possibly may be only an ocular illusion, for ocular illusions are sometimes more vivid than reality. But when I have rheumatism, it is utterly impossible for me to doubt that I really have it. Pain, pleasure, feeling, gratitude, avarice, conscience, free will, generosity, hope, hate, gout, and toothache, are things a man must believe in. He cannot help it.

Necessitarians say, that a man is obliged to obey the strongest motive and wish of the moment ; but a doctor now and then gives an instance of some man whose free will, but nothing else, is paralyzed.

* People who are in subjection to the world, (vanity, avarice, &c.,) the flesh, or the devil ("spirit which only denies," sneering intellect, ill-nature, malice, pride, &c.,) all such are apt to say they cannot believe in God. Well ! who ever said they could ? It is the "pure in heart" who are to see God.

The thorough-going Utilitarian, who ruminates like a cow, and never does anything else right or wrong, is apt to say he cannot understand how there can be such a thing as "right." Well ! who ever said he could ? It is the man who does the will of God who is to know the doctrine, whether it be of God. By the by, Aristotle said almost identically the same thing, i.e., that the only way to learn right is to do it.

His strongest wish is, say, to put his coat on. His muscles are in perfect order, and he is in perfect health in every other respect, but he cannot do it; and there he stands, in his shirt sleeves, helpless. Another man is extremely thirsty and a glass of water is brought to him. He is longing to take and drink it, but is unable to do so, and keeps his servant standing before him holding the tray for half-an-hour. Of course the Necessitarians would have no difficulty in reconciling this with their theories. Ingenuity can prove anything. Does a question hold out, double the ingenuity. Does it hold out still, double it again and the thing is done.

I have now relieved my mind of some thoughts that have been troubling its peace. Very few people are highly enough christianized to bear strongly-felt and clearly-expressed antagonism without offence; so I cannot expect to escape giving offence, extremely as I shall regret it: but I have written as I have done, from very strong feelings arising out of the consideration of the terrible suffering that is produced in the world by ignorance and superstition. That ignorance and superstition must cause suffering just in proportion to its degree, is a mere truism. Every cause must have its effect. Folly, as well as vice, must have its consequences. There is no escape. Whether I am right in my belief as to what is folly, ignorance, and superstition, is another question. I can only say that I have done my best to see the truth and to tell it.

The matters I have touched upon are endless. People talk of comprehensive or exhaustive treat-

ment of a subject ; but, in the first place, the French proverb says, “le secret d’ennuyer est de tout dire.” And in the second place, to talk of exhausting a subject is nonsense. All that even the wisest man can do in a world of infinities and indefinities is to contribute a few detached hints, and think himself fortunate, if one or two of them turn out to be useful.

The influence of book writing is probably much less than is supposed, (at any rate by the book writers themselves). But the estimate taken on the matter by book writers is perhaps only the old story, “There is nothing like leather.” Setting aside religious and poetical inspiration, books are useful to amuse, to fill time harmlessly, and to record facts ; but change of opinion in the world is principally accomplished by change in circumstances, facilities for intercommunication of ideas and the everyday talk of everyday people in everyday life, which talk turns out far more wit and wisdom than ever gets into books. Admirable books were written two hundred years ago against witchcraft, but the public was not ripe for them and they fell dead. Doctors will gradually drop their superstitions, and Vaccination will die in the course of years as Inoculation has died, and as Utilitarianism is dying now. But these things will take place probably just the same whether books are written about them or not. Still nobody can tell what may or what may not be the effect of anything he does, so each one is bound to do what he can even though it be nothing better than writing a book.

A P P E N D I X .

A.

At page 205 I have spoken of M. Comte as being not quite a sane man. Most people have heard his name, few have read his writings. The best concise view of them I know, is contained in two articles contributed by Mr. Mill to the Westminster Review. They have been re-published in one volume, and the account they give of an extraordinary man is very interesting.

My object in the few remarks that follow is to justify my assertion, that M. Comte's mind was a little off its balance, to say the least of it.

M. Comte's intellect was very great, and therefore, his writings must and do contain many things that are ingenious, many things that are clever, and some things that are even wise. To give one instance of the latter, he strongly condemned devoting too much time to matters requiring abstract thought on account of its tendency to produce "orgueil" and "secheresse" of character. Deficiencies in intellect he also looks upon as nothing when compared with deficiencies in will, character, passions, and feelings.

Comte's theory, which forms the foundation of his doctrines, is, that savages and uncultured persons are under the influence of theological ideas ; that

slightly cultured persons are under the influence of metaphysical ideas ; and that perfectly cultured people are under the influence of positive ideas. In other words, that uncultured people believe that all the things they see are caused by God or gods ; that slightly cultured people believe that they are caused by “ nature ” or “ virtues ” which are inherent in them ; and that perfectly cultivated people believe that they have had no cause or causes at all.

M. Comte does not believe in cause, but only in invariable sequences and antecedents. That is, if A a strong man knocks down B a weak one, M. Comte does not believe B's fall is caused by A, but only that it is a consequence which is invariably observed to ensue when he receives a violent blow from A. Thus he makes no difference in the matter of causation between day invariably succeeding night, and the sun's rays causing warmth.

To M. Comte's three stages of human progress it may be answered,—

(1.) That the lowest savages do not believe in a God, or in gods of any kind.

(2.) That the more cultured men become the more instead of less do they believe in God.

(3.) That however it may have been with a few dreaming half-crazy book writers, (men sometimes of great genius), the mass of mankind have always had too much common sense to believe that a general term such as “ nature ” was anything more than a convenient way of expressing in one word the visible works of God.

(4.) That whatever M. Comte thought himself able to do, no one else in his senses can believe, try as he will, that all he sees around him has had no cause.

Instead of Comte's fancy that belief marches from belief in many gods, through belief in one God, up to belief in no God, the real march is from belief in no God, through belief in many gods, up to belief in one God.

The lowest savages have no belief at all. Amongst those a little higher up we find belief in many gods. Indeed, to them, any bit of wood carved into the shape of a figure will do for a God, or Fetish, as it is called.

We are told of a Malay sailor who always carried one about him, and who trusted to it implicitly to keep him from harm. But one day he was flogged for some misdemeanor. This was a fatal blow to the Malay's faith in his Fetish, and he was overheard covering the wooden image with reproaches and railings. He said, "Is it for dis I have guarded you dese many years? Is it for dis I put parrots' feder in your tail and gave you de best ob eberyting? Is it for dis, &c., &c.?" and at last he finished by chucking his god overboard.

About Comte's "metaphysical" crotchet, whatever may have been the case with some fanciful book writers who used to be called realists, (in opposition to nominalists), and who believed that general terms, such as "nature" and "mankind," were positive entities instead of being single words used for convenience, to avoid having to employ long phrases;

the mass of mankind* have never been deluded into any such fancies.

The more men are cultured the more concise language becomes by the coinage of these general terms.

The early savage, to express "five," has to say "one and one and one and one and one." In the course of ages he becomes sufficiently cultured to express all this by one word ; in the meantime, as we are told by travellers, he refuses to have anything to do with any number larger than five, and under the circumstances this can hardly be wondered at. I will now mention as concisely as I can a few more of M. Comte's teachings.

He is a bitter enemy to liberty, and (strange in a Frenchman) to the opposing principle, "equality" also.

* The dreaming metaphysicians and notion spinners ignore all opinions but their own. All their writings are about each other's notions. They seem unconscious of the wisdom possessed by the mass of mankind which far exceeds theirs. But this wisdom is not found in books and these people only see books. The wisdom of popular proverbs exceeds the wisdom of the self-called wise ; and yet popular proverbs form only a fractional indication of popular wisdom. Of course, popular folly too is colossal sometimes ; but I am now talking of wisdom. The metaphysicians only know books. It is a necessary part of human nature to value what it knows and has to do with, and to depreciate what it has not to do with. The inhabitants of arid deserts wonder how people can live anywhere else. The Icelanders have a saying that God made Iceland, but left the rest of the world to be made by his subordinates. The Frenchman does not love the Englishman, the Englishman does not revere the Frenchman. Soldiers think little of Sailors, Sailors despise landlubbers in general, and lobsters, as they call them, in particular, &c.

The mass of mankind are to be treated like school-boys. Every action of their lives is to be regulated, even to the most minute particulars, by his priesthood, who are to be composed of positive philosophers; who are to be surrounded with reverence, and who are *all to agree together upon all subjects*. Their government is a sort of parody upon the Roman Catholic system. Elaborate services are to be held; but instead of the sign of the cross people are to touch with their fore-finger the phrenological organs on their heads.

Comte was a thorough Frenchman in his worship of systematization and classification. If a fact came in the way of his artificial system, so much the worse for the fact. Go it must. After the studies of his earlier life were over, he abstained on principle from all reading. He did this for the sake of mental health; by way he says of "*hygiène cérébrale*." He was afraid of his own ideas being impaired by admixture with those of other people. The result of this system of living on himself was a degree of self-conceit which Mr. Mill calls colossal.

M. Comte's system is one of parodies. He parodies Bacon, he parodies Christianity. Instead of the healthy moderation of Christian precepts, "to do unto others as you would have others do to you," and to be temperate in the gratification of natural impulses, M. Comte enjoins people never to give way to any natural impulse, as for instance, never to eat merely because they are hungry, but to do everything according to starched rules to be drawn up by himself or his sacerdotal orders of positive philoso-

phers, which rules are to be enacted with the sole view of benefiting his "Grand Etre," his "Fetish," his "metaphysical idea," his general term to which he superstitiously gives a living entity, like the "realists" whom he condemns, "*L'Humanité*."

There is no more nonsensical cant than the cant of humanity glorifying itself merely as humanity. What should we think of the inhabitants of the planet Venus always blowing their own trumpet in this ridiculous manner? Why is anyone better for being in the shape of a man when he is really only a brute or a devil? Granted that there are human or even divine possibilities in us all, if they are not realized, we are so much the worse instead of better. A good illustration of the three degrees of comparison is given by the incident of the sinking of the *Northfleet*, supposing the newspaper accounts to be correct. First the heroic self-sacrifice of the Captain. Secondly, the mere animal self-preserving instinct of the *Navvies*. Thirdly, the diabolical heartlessness of the *Murillo's* commander. The *Navvies* no doubt called themselves men, but they really at the moment were but a flock of terrified sheep. The Commander of the *Murillo* had it in his power to save every man, woman, and child, on board the *Northfleet* with perfect ease. He heard their despairing cries for help and then steamed quietly away.

By the bye, I wonder how the Comtists define their term "*L'humanité*." The only possible definition I can think of, is, "every individual human being ever born or to be born." But what would they mean by human beings? Would they include the

anthropoid gentlemen Mr. Darwin speaks of, and who are extinct now? But if so, where do they draw the line below them? Mr. Darwin says there is none.

Most Comteists believe in Darwin's theories.

L'Humanité says Comte is to be represented in sculpture by the figure of a woman of thirty with a child in her arms.

Men are to pray, but not to God. They are to pray to "Woman." They are to pray to "woman" because she is the "sexe aimant." The prayers are to consist of "commemoration" and "effusion."

Whom women are to pray to does not appear very clearly.

Men are to pray to "woman" every day for two hours, divided into three portions, the morning portion being the longest; the evening portion to be gone through in bed.

No woman is to work for her living.

No woman is to have any powers of government, even domestic.

No woman is to have any property of her own.

The entire political government is to be in the hands of the rich—rich manufacturers. But nations are first to be broken up into small states about the size of Belgium.

One Pontiff, the high-priest of humanity, is to be at the head of the whole human race. M. Comte himself to be the first.

All occupation of the intellect on matters not immediately useful to the public is to be rigidly put down by the spiritual authorities, who are also to

decide upon what is and what is not useful. Astronomy, for instance, may turn its attention to the sun, moon, and planets, but not to the distant stars.

All books in the world except one hundred volumes to be selected by M. Comte, are to be destroyed, as well as all animals and plants that are not decidedly useful to mankind.

In thirty years from the time he wrote, Comte said and really believed, that Positivism would be politically established in all civilized countries.

Instead of dating from the birth of Christ, people in all civilized countries will in future date from the beginning of the first French Revolution.

All temples for Comteist worship in all parts of the world are to point not towards the east, but towards the metropolis of humanity, "Paris."

Comte entertains a great respect for those persons who have "a fortunate inability to read." Amongst them alone, he says, can be found openness to truth, and minds unspoiled by private judgement.

Astronomy, he says, completely overthrows the doctrine of divine purpose in the arrangement of the solar system, because in many respects this system might greatly be improved, and by no means deserves the admiration bestowed upon it. The heavens according to Comte declare not the glory of God but the glory of Hipparchus, Kepler, and Newton.

The early part of his life Comte devoted to mathematics and matters of science ; but at forty-five, he fell under "une angélique influence" in the person of an "ange incomparable," whose name

was Clotilde de Vaux. This changed the whole current of his ideas, and led to his making "woman" the object of all worship. He calls Clotilde de Vaux the best personification of the supreme being; and even his maidservant, "l'incomparable Sophie," endowed, he says, with "a fortunate inability to read," became, in his mind, a model of perfection.

He says, that matter has life but not intelligence; and that before organized beings existed, every planet was alive, and gradually improved its own condition until it was fit to receive living things, when all the life was transferred to them.

Christianity says, that we should not do things for the praise of men, but for the praise of God—not in order to be seen of men, but the good we do, we should do in secret. "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." Christianity is a practical religion. It takes men as they are, and recognizing the human desire for reward, promises the love of God and eternal life, together with peace, joy, and happiness of mind.

What does M. Comte promise me?

He promises me the praise "of such a thing as I myself." Instead of hunger and thirst after righteousness, I am to hunger and thirst after the admiration of men. According to Comteism, the approval of his fellow creatures is to be the sole object of a man in all he does. The only logical inference I can draw from this is, that immediately a man thinks he has done a good action, he must at once send off an account of it to the *Times*, to the *Standard*, and to whatever newspaper happens to have the largest circulation in the world.

The word "faith," of course, M. Comte banishes from language, but he takes from Christianity Christian charity. He gives it however a new name, "altruism," and then seems to think he has discovered a new thing.

What more shall we say about M. Comte! teaching about the "praise of men." Is it French vanity, or craving for admiration gone mad? Or is it an illustration of Mr. Galton's theory, that town life tends to produce helplessness of character, loss of healthy self-trust, and an imbecile dependence on the opinions and support of other people? Is it one of the indications of that deterioration of which we hear and read so much, and which is supposed to be caused in men by a too closely packed gregariousness? At any rate, Comteism is a town growth. Weak leaning upon others has hitherto been more a French than an English characteristic; and, I believe, Mr. Galton intended his theory to refer to the failures of the French people in their late war.

A certain degree of isolation seems almost necessary for much religiousness of mind. The unceasing petty gossip of towns, allows neither time nor inclination for consciousness of the awful mystery and importance of life, and the wonder of everything. Self-dependence, self-respect, sense of duty, and trust in God, are all connected. So also are the contraries to these things. A man is necessarily self-confident when he knows he is doing what is right and pleasing to God. Whereas a dweller in towns says to himself, "really I don't know whether I must do this thing. It will no doubt be pleasing

to Mr. Brown, and perhaps also to Mr. Jones, but I am not at all sure about Mr. Robinson ;” and thus hesitating, he ends by leaving undone what he ought to do, or by doing what he ought not to do.

Too much isolation on the other hand, of course, is apt to produce narrowness and torpidity of mind.

After all, poor M. Comte was but a mouthpiece (a half crazy one I think most people will allow) of a narrow sect, the sect of Atheistic-Materialists, whose teaching is, that faith is folly, for what men believe in are lies ; that hope is folly, for what they hope for is a delusion ; that worship is folly, for there is no being to worship ; that reverence is folly, for there is nothing in the universe higher than men for them to look up to ; that there is no God, and that men die like dogs. This is the good tidings of great joy this sect brings to all people. Whilst there is only infinite pity for the poor Godless, hopeless propounders of these miserable doctrines, condemnation cannot be too strong, hatred cannot be too intense, and ridicule cannot be too bitter for the doctrines themselves, of which the one sole aim is, to cause spiritual death. A murderer only causes bodily death.

These doctrines, if successful, would sweep away the progress of ages, and bring men back to be savages, ignorant of, or denying all meaning to the very words which indicate that progress.

Happily, as yet, the sect has comparatively little influence. The members of it do not even, as a rule, bring up their own children in their degrading beliefs.

These strangely credulous people have a superstitious belief in "law;" self-enacted, self-acting laws of nature. But the idea of a law without a maker of it is really inconceivable to a sane mind. If law be defined to mean only invariable sequences and antecedents the inconceivability remains just the same. There must be some cause for their being invariable. Trying to conceive a self-enacted, self-acting law of nature is like trying to conceive the new licensing act to have been made by itself and policeman X, carrying out its provisions without knowing what he is doing, and without having received orders to do so. They must invent a new word. Law means an enactment made and enforced by some living mind and will.

The most distinguished men of science, such as Mr. Huxley, state, each in his own department, that M. Comte, when he enters upon that department, is altogether wrong in his facts and opinions. Nearly all moral and religious philosophers of repute state that, in their department, he is frightfully wrong.

Unselfishness, self-sacrifice, a reverential spirit, self-control, self-respect, humility, and trust in God, are usually observed to go together; and for those who possess these qualities in any very great degree, nearly all men, with the exception of the lowest savages, the criminal classes, some Utilitarians, and torpid-blooded philosophers, feel great veneration sometimes amounting to worship.

We learn from Mr. Mill that M. Comte's qualities were of an opposite description for the most part;

that although he wrote a great deal about what he called "altruism," he was really wrapt up in himself, and full of arrogance, vanity, and self-conceit ; that he quarrelled fearfully with his wife so that they had to separate, though he confessed she was blameless ; and that he was also always quarrelling with those with whom he had to do. Say what his admirers may, it is quite contrary to human nature to look up with any respect to such a man, whatever genius he may possess.

The writer of "The Natural History of Enthusiasm" discriminates very well between the man who really loves his fellow-creatures, and the man who only works up his imagination into an enthusiasm about humanity in general or mankind in the aggregate, showing that the latter will generally show utter heartlessness in the actual presence of actual people.

M. Comte was temperate in his habits ; almost, indeed, ascetic, except in the matter of snuff, of which he took great quantities. He was well-meaning and well-moralled. The reason so much attention has been drawn to him and his wonderfully elaborated works of imagination is, that the old Calvinistic and Roman Catholic interpretations of Christianity have died out amongst most educated people, whilst the newer and truer interpretations have not yet become established. In the meantime men are all abroad, and are ready to take to any earnest man who sincerely believes in his own doctrines, and who preaches them with sufficient talent and vigour. Of M. Comte's earnestness, talent, and vigour there can be no doubt.

Almost any very energetic thinker will do perhaps some good if only by encouraging the discussion of important matters ; besides which in the exact sciences, positivism, though not new since Bacon, is undoubtedly useful to counteract the opposite extreme of too much use of imagination.

B.

I have said at page 87 that all vice means, at bottom, general imbecility of nature. A common idea in opposition to this is, that great men who do the grandest things are not the men most free from vice. But it would be just as wise to say that a hurricane shows strength, because it appears to do grand things and to cause great destruction. On the contrary, a hurricane always arises from some deficiency somewhere in that strongest of all the powers of the universe, warmth from the sun. The hurricane comes and sweeps away everything. Foolish people gape and talk about the tremendous forces of nature. But one quiet life-giving beneficent ray from the sun is an infinitely stronger force than a hundred hurricanes. Some man like Attila, some poor ruthless scoundrel without human affections—a helpless slave to every selfishness ; without scruple, without a conscience, without a heart, without a soul—this man comes upon the stage of the world,

and in consequence of all these negations, of all these imbecilities, of all these miserable weaknesses aided by circumstances and by an active and ingenious brain he, like the hurricane, carries destruction wherever he goes. Foolish people gape and call him a great man. One short sentence written by a St. Paul or a St. John has exercised a power over men compared with which the maniacal automatic doings of legions of murderers, whether wholesale or retail, are nothing.

Sun warmth is the greatest material force known.

Christian passion or soul warmth is the greatest spiritual force known. Rascality means the absence of this force.

“The world knows nothing of its greatest men,” says the poet.

It is the hurricanes, earthquakes, and deluges that are talked about. The glorious days of sunshine that fill the world with life pass unnoticed.

Of course I know that hurricanes, pestilences, famines, Tasmanian devils,* and human devils, are wanted in the world or they would not be in it. But that is not the question.

Hurricanes clear the air. Pestilences teach men that they must suffer if they are filthy, vicious, and idle. Tasmanian devils keep noxious reptiles under. Human devils have been instruments by which effeminate races of men have become replaced by superior ones, the standard of energy, vigour, and militant capacities, (qualities essential for all, whether

* A kind of ferocious wild cat in Van Dieman's Land.

saints or sinners*) has been kept up upon this earth, and mankind has been saved from degeneration. Those who have studied the criminal classes say that although some criminals have very active brains, they are all deficient in real intelligence as well as in every other human quality. In fact, that they are imbecile specimens of the human race.

c.

I will give you one more instance of Government muddle.

An act has lately been passed (undoubtedly much wanted) for the protection of British birds during the breeding season. It came into operation in the middle of last March.

A writer to the *Times* describes the way the act works. He says, "judge of my surprise when I "saw, in a field adjoining my house, the old familiar

* Christianity means the whole of human nature—the whole building, top story included. Paganism is without the top story. The lower stories are of course necessary, and as much a part of the one building as of the other.

It is the custom now amongst a certain class of writers to speak in a more or less depreciating manner about Christianity. Being men usually with sharp heads and blunt souls, they are incapable of seeing what Christianity really is. What they mean by Christianity is, generally, on the continent Roman Catholic, in England Calvinistic Superstitions.

“sight—a big blackguard looking fellow with all his bird catching apparatus in full work. I went to him and threatened to bring a policeman, but he coolly replied, “The Bobby aint no use ; I’ve got the hact in my pocket ; I’m a catching linnets and chaffinches as aint mentioned in the hact.” Of course, once allow a “big blackguard looking fellow” to catch linnets and chaffinches, and the act at once becomes a dead letter.

Upon examining the act, I find, true enough, that the names of many birds, such as the rook, jackdaw, chaffinch, linnet, house sparrow, common titmouse, &c., are omitted. Of course, the explanation is that her Majesties’ Government is not aware that the rook, jackdaw, chaffinch, linnet, house sparrow, and common titmouse are British birds. Nor am I for a moment blaming them for their want of knowledge. Charming as natural history is as a pursuit, it would be unreasonable to expect denizens of cities, burdened with the weighty affairs of nations, to be deeply versed in its mysteries. Still the instance tends to illustrate my position, that Government interference should be reduced to the minimum possible.

D.

At page 193 I have made some rather depreciating observations about theorists of the Utopian and communistic tone of mind, who think they are going to regenerate society ; who dream dreams ; who

shut their eyes to realities and to facts of human nature; and who really believe in their coming millennium when everybody is to have a thousand a year. But after all, they are a very curious and interesting sect, and when their dreams are prompted by benevolence, as is sometimes the case, it is impossible to help trying to believe in the truth of them.

According to one of these theories, absolute social equality is the right thing, and all assistance given by the rich to the poor is equally degrading to the giver and the receiver. Indeed, if newspaper reports are to be trusted, Mr. W. Vernon Harcourt says, in so many words, that the whole system of assistance almost universal in country districts on the part of the well-to-do towards their poorer friends and neighbours is completely pernicious and wrong.

As men are generally made, perhaps the best way of explaining things is by illustrations that realize them to the imagination.

I am the squire of my parish.

Not long ago I learnt that a poor woman in the village was a terrible sufferer from rheumatic fever. The doctor said it was absolutely necessary that she should be removed to a town ten miles off for better air, better accommodation, and better nursing. But she was too poor to bear the expense of removal. Now came my difficulty. In such cases it is, of course, the custom in country districts for the squire or the parson of the parish to manage the matter. But I had just been reading Mr. W.

V. Harcourt's speech. I had been reading it, I need not say, with great interest; for it related to people in my position, and I am always trying to gain instruction from the words of eminent men.

What then was I to do? Was I to leave the poor woman where she was, to die, in accordance, as it seemed to me, with the teaching I had just been receiving, or was I to sin against the gospel of social equality and remove her? Perhaps I ought to be ashamed to confess that at last I decided upon the latter alternative, and did not leave her to die. On the contrary, shutting my eyes to the truth as it is in Utopia, following the custom of my class, giving way weakly to the degrading instincts of my narrow-minded squire progenitors, I just ordered a mattress to be rigged up in my omnibus and sent the woman off. Still the question remains, was this a justifiable proceeding on my part, or was it not a justifiable proceeding?

To be serious, I look upon Mr. Harcourt's enunciation upon this subject to be as eccentric as anything one ever hears from that most eccentric of all sects, the sect of communists. How are we to account for this eccentricity?

We all know that politicians often profess strange and extreme views, and that they do so from a great variety of motives; but when any individual instance comes before me I always try to attribute the best motives I can think of.

In a case like the present then, I can well suppose it possible for a great intelligence to be, for a time, swamped by an overflow of philanthropic sensibilities

and gush of bubbling benevolence. “L’esprit, says Rochfaucault, est toujours la dupe du cœur.” I can well imagine when this takes place, how the eyes of the understanding may become darkened; how the wish may become father to the belief; how, in the mind of the gushing enthusiast, facts may be wiped away like cobwebs, how poverty may become a thing that is not; how the millennium may become a thing that is; how social equality may already reign supreme, how to give may become a presumptuous assumption of superiority and to receive a degrading acknowledgment of it.

Dreams all.

The poor shall never cease out of the land. Inspired wisdom and newest science agree there. In the struggle of life, the stronger must excel the weaker. It is the law of God that prevents degeneration, and the law of God is stronger than the law of Mill. Mr. Mill may be called the king of the communists. Not that he calls himself one, but his later writings lead logically and directly to communism, and he is the only man in England of culture, character, good intentions, and genius the sect has at all on its side.

E.

In the preceding pages I have repeatedly alluded to that bias of the mind which so often unconsciously leads to false conclusions. I will give one more instance of it.

The late Daniel O'Connell was once defending, as counsel, a man charged with murder. O'Connell made no speech to the jury, contenting himself with producing, in the witness box, the murdered man alive and perfectly well. The case was in some way connected with politics. Party feeling ran very high. A strong bias was entertained against the prisoner. And in consequence of this bias, the jury, after a short consultation, brought in a unanimous verdict of "guilty."



Accession no. 23947

Author Constable:

Doctors, vaccination
utilitarianism.

1873.

Call no. Inoc.

Vacc.

